



BL 240.2 .E43 1963
Elder, Frederick Stanton,
1868-
Morals and religion

MORALS AND RELIGION

LIBRARY OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
MAY 14 1963
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

MORALS and RELIGION

by FRED ELDER



PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY

New York

© Copyright, 1963,
by Philosophical Library, Inc.
15 East 40th Street, New York

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 62-18534

Printed in the United States of America

DEDICATION:

"These lines are affectionately dedicated to my son and four daughters and to their posterity after them, in the hope they all may arrive at years of maturity free from every trace of superstition and 'supernaturalism' and with sufficient inner development to bear them strongly through the myriad pitfalls of the world without necessity for restraint from without."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Prefatory, Preliminary, Personal	ix
Part One	
I Introduction	3
II Morals and Religion vis-à-vis	14
III A Truth-caring People	32
IV Wanted, an Answer	56
V Mind, Morals, Religion—Their Relation	60
Part Two	
THE RECORDS OF RELIGION WHEN IN POWER	
VI Israel Grows in Power	89
VII Christianity (Roman Catholic) Grows in Power	96
VIII France Grows in Power	115
IX Islam	136
X Exodus—Book of the World's Biggest Lies	152
XI Christianity or Humanism—a Religion or a Devotion	168

PREFATORY, PRELIMINARY, PERSONAL

Evolution, within a hundred years after its discovery by Darwin and Wallace, has attained world-wide primacy as the unifier and clarifier of life, of human thought and world relationships. A knowledge of evolution now prevails dominantly in all circles of established scientific thought and knowledge and of cultured minds. But all too inadequately outside those circles. In that same hundred years the power and influence of supernaturalism, of the God-idea, of their vehicle religion(s) and their media for propaganda and expansion: the Bible, the Koran, the Vedas etc, declined in those same circles.

The writer of this volume seeks to popularize the known truths about the scientifically established facts concerning evolution—concerning religion, the God-idea, Humanism, men's minds and the inter-relationships of all these. My discourse is addressed to the devotees of the spirit of science and all its branches and, through their interest, to the “mass-mind of the world.”

The first World War started me writing *War And the God-idea*. This extended naturally beyond the mere contradictions of a war-prayer psychology into a conjoint expository “philosophy” of naturalism, evolutionism, realism, Humanism. From this came the idea that I might reasonably try to offer the world something to help supplant the gospel of mythology and supernaturalism now so plainly on its

way out for the advancing minds of intellect, culture, science and philosophy.

More particularly I am addressing the rising generations in high schools and colleges (and their parents); the sons and daughters of well-convinced Humanists (and *their* parents) and all others troubled by disbeliefs or doubts as to orthodox religious indoctrinations in these days of rapid rise of world-changing knowledge of facts that has been established by the amazing growth of science. Many, indeed, are highly dissatisfied with what religion and the orthodox religionists have to offer them and, having abandoned this, are organizationally footloose. To such I present the merits, advantages and services of the various forms of Secularism with their opportunities for conjoint, co-operative activities of a constructive social nature.

I am now past 90 years old. My greatest desire is to help to promote more rational thinking in a highly irrational, deplorably under-educated world; to help depopularize some of the most palpable falsehoods that have dominated men's thoughts for millenniums, and ultimately to help consolidate the forces of Science and Rationalism against what I conceive to be the world's greatest illusions. The positions and pronouncements here offered are not certified unqualifiedly as true. They are the carefully considered opinions which I have reached after having carried on my own "Quest For Certainty" in many branches of science, in philosophy and biblical criticism during most of my mature lifetime. Now I am trying to tell the world how much well-demonstrated hokum, self-serving propaganda and downright falsification it must eliminate from the religious domain so that man may rightly understand the world of realities as this is known to the world of science and ethics.

As a widely prevailing popular opinion holds that morality is an essential element of religion, I have been at pains to devote a full chapter (II) to an analytical, historical study of the origin and nature of both morality and religion.

Thus I can select and present a most soundly supported concept and definition of religion which correspond with the actualities of the situation. As my writing deals so largely with the word and concept of Religion it becomes an essential preliminary that I discuss this idea here at some length; with a hundred or so reputed definitions of Religion we ask:

RELIGION—WHAT IS IT?

I shall not attempt to “give you the Works.”

1) This is from *Recent Religious Psychology*, (pp. 222-3) by the Rev. A. Rudolph Uren, a Scottish divine. In it he reviewed and criticised nine books on the Psychology of Religion and kindred topics. He says: “Psychologists apparently need to be reminded that religious experience—is for the religious man experience of God, and that religious consciousness is not ethical consciousness, social consciousness, or any other kind of consciousness, but simply God-consciousness.

“Generally speaking, religion is that psychological phenomenon of life which is indissolubly bound up with the conviction that unseen superhuman power or powers exist and control the destiny of the individual and the race, to whom men may look for succor or help to conserve the values they deem most precious and with whom they may have fellowship. We hold with Wundt (*Elements of Folk Psychology* p. 369) that, strictly speaking, religion comes into being only with the rise of the God-idea.”

“The object of religious consciousness is always a power or powers conceived of as greater than oneself, with whom one retains personal relations—Men—seek fellowship with God for its own sake—Psychologists of Religion seem to ignore all across the simple fact that a religious man is one who has fellowship with God, and is conscious of that fellowship.”

2) From *Treatise On The Gods*, revised edition, 1948, (pp. 4, 5) by the late Mr. Henry L. Mencken, well known

American writer and literary critic. He would not have been disturbed by being described as “non-religious.”

“Nevertheless, it (Religion) is quite simple at bottom. There is really nothing secret or complex about it—Whether it happens to show itself in the artless mumbo-jumbo of the Winnebago Indian or in the elaborately refined and metaphysical rites of a Christian archbishop, its single function is to give men access to the powers which seem to control his destiny, and its single purpose is to induce these powers to be friendly to him. That function and that purpose are common to all religions, ancient or modern, savage or civilized, and they are the only characters that all of them show. Nothing else is essential. Religion may repudiate every sort of moral aim or idea, and still be authentically religion.—(It may reject) immortality and even the concept of the soul, and yet hold its character and its name.—It may imagine its gods as beings of unknown and unknowable nature and faculties, or it may imagine them as creatures but slightly different from men.—it may credit them with virtue—lay to them vices or weaknesses—It may think of them as numerous or solitary, as mortal or as immortal.—But so long as it believes them capable at their will to condition the fate of men, whether on this earth or elsewhere, and so long as it professes to be capable of influencing that will to his benefit, that long it is religion, and as truly deserving of the name as the most highly wrought theological system ever heard of.”

3.) To the foregoing I add the following from *Religion: Its Function In Human Life*, 1946, (p. 297) by the late Knight Dunlap, Professor of Psychology, Univ. of Calif. at Los Angeles: “The task for religion in the future, in respect to morals, seems to be not leading progress, but co-operating with other agencies until those other agencies are able to carry on alone.”

4.) From these we may conclude generally, then, that Religion is the belief, feeling, life-reaction of a person or

group toward a conceived, unlimited, supernatural power they call God and to whom they feel they can resort, confide, appeal with more or less hope of attention, relief, comfort, satisfaction, as occasion may warrant. Religion does not necessarily include morality.

The main thing that has made Religion (with its gods, devils, heavens, hells) so widely accepted among the masses has been the ignorance of their parents and themselves of its false bases, plus their appreciation of the moralities in their manifold forms. These latter, as we shall presently see, are all of purely human origin—indispensable as survival elements in the evolution of the man and the tribe and all wholly independent of gods, devils, heavens, hells. All these moralities have been impressed upon them in childhood by religious parents or, where these were not religious, by their “tribe’s medicine men” (the priests) as being commandments by the gods—“Thou shalt (or shalt not)” —and so come naturally to be regarded generally as fundamental to Religion. Thus arose Religion’s world-wide prevalence in its widely variant forms.

But the modern world, from what is termed ‘The World of Science’ down, grows more intellectual, more cultured, more ‘anti-supernaturalistic’, far more understanding that the one-time mysteries of early days are now being widely explained on a purely naturalistic basis or classed as myths or legends or as pure falsehoods if hopelessly antinaturalistic. To all who have the curiosity and/or the intellectual honesty to desire to learn the recorded facts, these are to be found, superabundantly, recorded in Nature and set forth by physics, geology, astronomy, biology, genetics, palaeontology, psychology, history well proving that much of the ancient record of alleged supernatural or superhuman action can be only mythical, legendary, false, naturally incredible to reasoning and reasonable minds. Many examples later.

But our intelligent, incredulous modernists, mentioned

above, are in the main also intellectually—honest truth-seekers, equally moral with any of Religion's votaries. Their attitude is well illustrated by that of a friend of mine—a single woman past middle age, in a 'Free Thought' group which ignores prayers and ritual, active in social service and welfare work and often called 'friend of all the world' by those who know her best. I doubt if she has said a prayer since childhood's "Now I lay me—," yet she very definitely maintains that she is religious. Her idea calls for careful study.

This we shall make with the aid of two university professors of philosophy. One is the head of the philosophy department of a state University. I had sent him some manuscript upholding the comprehensiveness and essentiality of Mencken's definition of Religion (above). I said: "—all that lies outside of that definition belongs strictly in the domains of morality and sociality, however much they may be claimed by Religion." I had cited the Jews who forsook Jehovah, then sacrificed their sons by fire to Baal (*Jeremiah vii:30-31*) and Jephtha who burned his daughter because of his vow to his God for victory. (*Judges xi:29-40*) Were not these the *most religious* because of their greater sacrifice? Thus I sustained Mencken.

The Professor replied at considerable length. He began by saying: "Nothing appears to me to be more urgently needed today than the *liberation* of morals from supernatural and otherwise unscientific associations, and along with other pragmatists and scientific humanists (notably John Dewey) I have fought this uphill battle." Later he went on to say:

"A definition of religion in terms of (supernatural) doctrines is misleading and inaccurate because, essential as the doctrines may be or may have been to any specific, historical religion, equally if not more essential are the practical beliefs or the moral beliefs about right conduct.—religious creeds, myths and theology grew out of religious cults—one

must get back to the cults and (on back) to the legitimate aspirations, needs and ideals which, for want of a scientific understanding of nature and human nature, got distorted in the cults and more distorted in the creeds.

"It is the feeling for supreme values vital to the welfare of the group and the feeling of dedication to these values which seems to me to be the heart of any true definition of religion."

This seems to me to be very like the religious philosophy of the late Prof. John Dewey. He gave expression to quite similar ideas in his book, **A COMMON FAITH**. Professor Dewey did not admit that there is *a* religion. There are many groups differing as to beliefs, which have religious feelings and engage in religious activities; with him the word is always used adjectively, 'religious.' Where my first Professor would speak of certain feelings and activities of which the possession constitutes the possessor's religion, Prof. Dewey would simply say the person has religious feelings or ideals and in striving to realize them for human welfare he is doing religious acts. Never would he say the person has religion or belongs to *a* religion.

But from start to finish both Professors are definitely against supernaturalism and have labored for that "*liberation* of morals from (it) and otherwise unscientific associations." Both have been active in promoting the expansion of Humanism and of Humanists as a group. As a group Humanists may be considered as being united by the possession of those "feelings for supreme values vital to the welfare of mankind and feelings of dedication to these values"—to the task of realizing such values and ideals. In general they may be considered anti-supernaturalistic though here they draw no dividing line, feeling rightly that many supernaturalists also possess such Humanistic feelings and ideals and that with more enlightenment will presently move into full humanistic understanding. Prof. Dewey felt that supernaturalism, by suggesting possibilities or promises of supernatural

help toward accomplishments, became thus a veritable burden or drag against the achievement of Humanistic ends.

The definition of Religion as the possession of the feelings given just above plus a dedication to a realization of such values and ideals, may be called a Humanistic definition. In all such references I am using Humanism in a perfectly general sense as embracing all "liberally religious" groups: Atheists, Ethical Culturists, 'Free-Thinkers', Humanists 'proper,' Rationalists, Secularists etc, and I am now accepting that definition as my own.

In my writings where I have criticized the gross immoralities and atrocities committed through many centuries by supernaturalistic religionists in the name of their religion, I have used the word 'religion' without any qualifying word and I here ask that it be understood as meaning the supernaturalistic type. Such mass immoralities and inhumanities are never conceivably attributable to members of the Humanistic groups.

In only one chapter have I deemed it advisable to specify "supernaturalistic" when I was referring to a group or person as religious as this word is commonly understood—very rarely elsewhere.

MORALS AND RELIGION

PART ONE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

“The consensus of scholarship can go to hell for all I care.” The “Rev.” Billy Sunday. Quoted in the magazine *Evolution* of January, 1928.

“The most powerful thing in the world is an idea for which the time is ripe.” Victor Hugo.

Every day, the world over and especially during war times, the priests and preachers of the orthodox religions, and their faithful adherents as ordinary mortals, beg God to do this, that or the other thing. Do these millions of professional prayer-sayers and their hundreds of millions of contributing and supporting followers all over the world really believe that God can be so influenced to do the things they ask? Do *you* so believe? If you do, look around at the world and appraise the results. We shall be examining into these claims and questions—and more—without reservation or evasion, and present them here for the average reader to consider.

But every man is in bondage to many persistent, current beliefs established in childhood. If these lack a solid foundation in fact and truth, much of his life will be wasted in futilities. The present business of every man is to determine, as best he may, his true position and bearings in the world of thought and then strive to set himself on a course which he will not have to abandon because he finds false in-

doctrinations misleading his thinking. The only guide which he is by nature bound to rely on is his mind, his natural power of reason. This has evolved naturally as surest and most ultimate guide in life. Even when he satisfies himself by letting his priest or clergyman (or even a Humanist doctrinaire) do his thinking, he is, by so much, exercising his own mind. If *that* be all, then that *is* all.

But evolutionary processes never stop. If his mind, as so far developed, fails to enable him to distinguish the true from the false or the highly probable from the highly improbable, he has no recourse but to continue as a deluded man and take the consequences. Jesus will not save him from the consequences of ignorance, incapacity or indifference.

All this is particularly important for the young. The strides of advancing science are now forcing them widely to reject the fables, legends, myths, miracles, books, taught them in youth as "Gospel truth." Many of the young, once started on a false basis of knowledge of their world, suffer a shock when they learn that much of their religious indoctrination does not square with matters of ordinary scientific knowledge. I once heard a mother in a meeting (with her preacher trying to shush her down) complain bitterly that the schools were making an atheist of her son. He had been learning some commonplace facts of geology. I recall my own wonder as a college sophomore when my history professor amusedly negatived my sophomoric ideas as to the "Creation," the Noachian deluge and my biblical notions as to ancient history and the antiquity of man. I now know that Adam, Eve, Noah, his ark and the deluge, simply could not have been as the bible tells. How not but it were better to be a sincere atheist than to possess a mind which, under religious sanctions, rejects the scientific facts about the earth's early history and so to remain in error throughout life?

Many find it emotionally impossible to rectify their

courses when wrongly begun. Twice I have said to women peddling "free salvation" tracts: "Lady I am sorry for you. In the public library are encyclopedias and hundreds of science books which upset the whole bible story of Adam, his 'fall: the original sin,' and hence his need for redemption and salvation. Look them up and learn the truth: There was no Adam."

Both times I was turned on fiercely with replies in effect that: "You needn't be sorry for me. I'd rather have my bible and Jesus than all the books the college professors could write." Like Billy Sunday (as above) such minds have no interest in "the consensus of scholarship," in what the world of science has proved to be the truth.

No exception can be taken to the social spirit here shown—giving their time gladly to saving souls from hell, but ignorantly promoting irrationality and falsehood in a world already too full of both; wasting endlessly the world's willing human resources which, with proper education, at the proper time (including freedom from false tutelage) could have been enlisted profitably in any one of many essential social activities. Millions of others miss even that much hint of sources of information that could give them an intellectual lift. Thus the mass-mind remains through life a thrall to childhood's illusions, and in general quite needlessly so. Whether by pedagogic ignorance or by conscious pedagogic malpractice, millions are still being, and untold future millions will continue to be, led educationally astray, victimized by the false indoctrinations of religion.

These millions are entitled to the factual and historical world knowledge and the social and intellectual guidance that is now being withheld from them, whether ignorantly or deliberately by religious teachers.

For the intellectual world, evolution as a philosophy of nature is now thoroughly established. It is now fully supported by every branch of science. It explains the successions and relationships in the inorganic world of earth and

stone, the existence and relationships of the ancient fossils of plants and animals as found in the rocks, the presence, appearance, condition and causal relationships, each to each of all portions of nature, including man.

Human life, of course, is just what it has become by this evolutionary process which recognizes no supernatural factors or elements in any of its stages. Consequently Humanism is now fairly on its way to replace the religions of orthodoxy and become man's proper guide for his proper living.

It is little more than two generations ago that "Billy" Sunday, popular evangelist of the early decades of the 20th century, made a triumphal tour of the big cities of the United States to the applause of cheering millions and with the active support of probably ninety per cent or more of the nation's Protestant clergy and 100 per cent of the nation's press. Especial "tabernacles" were erected for his meetings. Here packed multitudes nightly roared their approval when he stepped to the pulpit's edge and with a gesture consigned Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, as evolutionists to hell.

This low-water mark of intellectual degradation in the United States under religious auspices has been approached only by the appearance, speeches and cross-examination of William J. Bryan at the Scopes "monkey trial" in Tennessee in 1925. Of this more later. Were Mr. Sunday now alive and doing a repeat, the clergy might possibly be a bit more coy, but the press, largely, could be expected to continue its support, as it now does that of "Billy" Graham, on the basis of that index of popularity, the financial "take."

The purpose of this book is directed against the conditions which produce and foster such exhibitions of intellectual depravity. I definitely know nothing that is doing more to retard the progress of intelligence and truth than the continuing promulgation of the bible as "The Word of

God," and its continuing wide acceptance as such by the masses.

The dependence of morality upon religion, which the church has always maintained to be a fact, is here positively denied. In five later chapters I undertake definitely to prove the falsity of that idea.

According to the definition of religion, the ideas of good works, honesty, morality, charity and general good behaviour ethically, which so often have attached themselves or been attached to the idea of religion, form no essential part of that idea. As we shall see presently, awful crimes, massacres, human sacrifices have taken place in the name of God and religion and at the direction of her gods and priests. The good behaviourisms just noted are all practiced by many people, among them a majority of the world's leading men in science and philosophy, a large and increasing percentage of whom take a steadily decreasing interest in supernaturalism. What I am to present will not be rightly received nor understood if it be taken or misrepresented as any sort of reflection on the ethical values of good behaviour. I am undertaking to show that morality and its philosophy or science, ethics, do not belong in the domain of religion. Morality is purely naturalistic and humanistic in its concepts and origins—an evolutional element of social and individual survival—something religion never has been (for this world.) One basic purpose of this study is to separate true ethical values from their false, unethical associations with a rapidly failing and increasingly discredited supernaturalism and establish them on a purely humanistic base.

As we shall see presently: everything discoverable in society that is morally uplifting (even the moral teachings of the 'prophets' of whatever cult or variety of religion) are strictly evolutionary and humanistic in their origins and development. Never has there been any "divine revelation"

of wisdom. Isaiah, Amos, Micah, Buddha, Confucius, Mohammed, Christ, in all their yearnings and strivings for the moral and social betterments they sought, were definitely moved by humanistic principles. It was these which they interpreted as "the Spirit of God" operating within them—a theocratic, theologic idea induced by the intense religious atmosphere natural to a time when "God" was the explanation of everything not as yet explained. Such were the strong emotional interests that caused such individuals to strive for improved human relationships in the world. In other words our thesis is that all the good ever produced or discovered in the world originated naturally in the minds of men who (by so much at least) were entitled to be called good men.

Humanism might well be referred to and regarded as a philosophy of life, as a 'Devotion,' rather than as a Religion, so that it might remain ever free from the connotations of supernaturalism which hitherto the word religion has necessarily carried. Yet its sole reason-for-being is that it may be used as a daily living guide and philosophy by its adherents to promote their own and the general moral or ethical social welfare. Just what it is and stands for will be set forth more particularly in the sequel. Now, in our beginnings, we must be concerned with the validity of the God-idea itself.

In contrast with science the way of religion is and always has been the way of authority, and faith in that authority—with an authority which now grows feebler and a faith which grows weaker with every rise in the average of human intelligence. All scientific knowledge is public knowledge, subject to open demonstration, challenge, check and verification by anyone competent to investigate. It grows ever stronger with every advance of the human mind.

For more than a thousand years Science has been on the defensive in a deadly struggle waged against it steadily, fiercely, unceasingly, by the promoters of religion. And Science has won every battle in this age-long warfare. But

Religion has always maintained a special and heavy tabu against the challenges of skepticism; against the critical question: "Does the God-idea stand for anything which really exists?" This tabu has ever stood as the chief obstacle in the way of open study of the merits of the thesis of the importance of or necessity for today's supernaturalism and its supposed indispensability for the support of human morality.

But from now henceforward let it be clearly understood by all the world that the boot is on the other foot. *It is the "supernatural world," not evolution, which stands in the position of pure hypothesis.* For enlightened minds it is now that world which is thrown on the defensive before the maturing opinion of the world's most qualified thinkers.

Here now at last we come to a real showdown. Now the forces of science, no longer seriously on the defensive against a high-riding and overwhelming theocratic power, are about due to unite in a definite offensive to carry the flag of human enlightenment against this highest citadel of the opposition.

What is the God-idea? Why is it? How did it originate? Aside from whatever purely subjective results may occur in the minds of true believers, does God really answer prayer; or is the whole procedure of the professional prayer-sayers merely "mumbo-jumbo?" Does God really intervene—*is there really a God who does, or ever did (or even who does not) intervene in men's affairs*, either in answer to prayers or otherwise? Is there any slightest evidence that mind, mentality, intellect, conscious being, has ever been found anywhere, independent of an organized system of nerve and brain tissue? If so, what is that evidence? How? Where? In what manner do any such disembodied intelligences exist? The whole world wants to know.

In the absence of open, verifiable, repeatable, public revelations, why may not the whole "supernatural world" have had its origins in the limitless power of the imaginings

of the minds of men? What other source of origin *could* there have been? If such superhuman or supernatural mind (or minds) or Power(s) be real, let it (them) step out into the open light of day and convince the world by facing test conditions such as science must face every minute of every day. Let them make themselves felt, seen, heard and be identified for what they may be, *quite independent of human intermediaries of any sort*, and so prove their existence definitely to all the world. To prove this to "true believers and faithful followers" cannot and will not suffice.

If, through the steady advance of science, intelligence and skepticism, the "Kingdom of God on earth" seems on its way to repudiate God's control and even the credibility of his existence, this might mean only that the democratic-republic of Humanism is coming into its own. In such case, if God *really* exists and *really* desires to save that Kingdom, and in compassion save all mankind from the eternal, condign, biblical penalties for universal disbelief, he may have no other recourse than to create in human minds the faiths and beliefs needful for the saving of both; than to make some form of convincing, world-wide, open-air, materializing demonstration that would once and for all time certify its divine origin and the presence of its divine producer to the minds of all the world—say a message in the sky in all languages day and night for, say, a month, or even a year, if any skeptics still held out. That would be a genuine, unquestionable, supernatural revelation. Probably nothing much less than something of that sort would satisfy the world of science. But it would be done for all time as the world of science would not hesitate to accept and record the fact (much as it would the visit of a comet with a calculated period of a hundred years) and then proceed to find out what, if any, true relationship such a revelation bore to the "natural world" hitherto so called to distinguish it from the foretime wholly hypothetical "supernatural world."

If the faithful cry "Presumptuousness" at such "setting

up of conditions for God," let them remember (1) that these are the intellects which God, himself, (allegedly) created and he might even be pleased to discover a product which could stand up in his presence and say: "I will not be deceived if I can prevent it. If it be God, show me. I shall then be glad to believe, but I have no faiths to waste on the false." (2) Let us not forget that at this stage of our study we are discussing a purely hypothetical God about whom we may well make any kind of consistent hypothesis we please. But let the demonstration proceed as it may, or even not at all! I alone am judge of what is adequate for my mind; and so of course each for himself.

"*Diis injuria, diis curae.*" (The injuries to the gods are their own affair.) But this has never sufficed for the priesthoods of the world who always seek to inflame the minds of the faithful into violent action against "God's enemies." (see later chapters) Yet why should the "Creator and Sustainer of the Universe" hesitate, or find anything "difficult" or "undignified" in sustaining his own; or anything "presumptuous" in a request that he stabilize human thinking by producing a convincing demonstration? Every day he must be getting millions of requests, far more bizarre, through the channels of ordinary prayer. Do these provoke him? and what becomes of them?

Would it be immeasurably ridiculous for the whole religious world to unite in prayer at some specified hour of some specified day and, by some such demonstration, ask God to confute the skeptics once and for all time? Should it succeed, it would end all doubt, anchor God forever on the throne of his earthly kingdom and every priest for life in a seat of authority in his parish. Does anyone think they would dare unite and give it a try?

I am now past 90 years of age. My mature life has been given largely to intellectual activities. For more than the last-passed years my opinions and judgments have been matured by an increasing interest in and study of science,

philosophy, history, psychology and the cults of religion. This has constituted my own "Quest for Certainty." Now these opinions and judgments are offered for what values may be found in them as a prophylactic against religious emotional imbalance, for in all these years I have found the claims in my basic thesis steadily growing stronger; namely that:

1. "The (alleged supernatural) powers which seem to control (man's) destiny" are purely mythical, so far as concerns their possession (or, better, their disclosure) of any awareness of man's presence in the universe; that

2. The notion that religion can "give man access to (any such) powers" or "induce those powers to be friendly to him" is probably man's greatest illusion; and that

3. All human time and energy spent in pursuit of these illusions are time and energy diverted from and so wasted as against man's far more important need to master the secrets which give him power over nature and understanding of himself and his fellows. This power and understanding would enable us to shape our lives and human relationships so that every individual born on earth might find opportunity to develop every beautiful or socially useful endowment that he brought with him into life. Here also is the time, opportunity and occasion to organize effective social safeguards against all who are found to be socially unsafe and to establish proper, humane, correctional and educational methods to transform these latter, so far as possible, into a sound, substantial, safe citizenry.

In the pages that follow I submit to your reason the details of the evidence and the reasons that have shaped my opinions and judgments and led me to adopt, maintain and present the ideas of the above thesis.

There are in the world many millions of people who have not passed beyond the high-school educational stage, nor even into it. Most of these are victims of what I regard as highly mischievous religious miseducation; yet many

are sufficiently aware of their plight to be highly dissatisfied with what orthodoxy has to offer. Among these millions, all with the capacity to receive the facts and knowledge that has produced the prevailing trends of modern thought (surely an enormous number) should have opportunity to get acquainted with the conclusions now recognized either as thoroughly established or as well supported and surely and steadily gaining favor along those frontiers of thinking bordering on the domains of science, philosophy and the putative domain of religion.

Any attempt to bring about such an educative change in the world will call for a co-ordinated effort by all devotees of the spirit of science who see this problem in its full magnitude and proper light. It is only they who are as yet competent to become the evangelists to bring the gospel of evolutionary Humanism to "the mass-mind of the world." Let them receive their mission with a fitting sense of their responsibility. My purpose here is to help make clear the definite world-necessity and the bases for using it to replace the supernaturalism of "the old" religion. My sole ambition is to aid in a steadily increasing movement to promote such increased mass movement toward mental liberation. The professors and philosophers are expected to participate—ultimately one hundred per cent. The contest between the "old Religion" (Supernaturalism) and Science-plus-Humanism is only now being begun. Now-a-days Religion, for the first time in its history, is being put genuinely on the defensive and recognized by the devotees to the spirit of science, and ultimately by all others, as definitely so placed.

CHAPTER II

MORALS AND RELIGION VIS-A-VIS

"Now that moral injunctions are losing the authority given by their supposed sacred origin, the secularization of morals is becoming imperative." Herbert Spencer, 1879. *Data of Ethics*. Preface.

Up to now (1962), in spite of his 83-year-old warning, little is yet being done in any formal way toward achieving Mr. Spencer's "Secularization of Morals." The prevailing "official" popular theory of morals is still the theological or religious one, namely: that men get their ideas of good and evil, right and wrong, the laws of moral conduct, by scriptural revelations through the bible, priests and clergy and that conscience is God-given and so in religion's domain. John Calvin, the "first" Presbyterian, says in his "Institutes": "Everything pertaining to the perfect life the Lord has so comprehended in his law that there remains nothing to add to that summation." Today we have advanced materially beyond that position, yet repeatedly we still hear the claim that religion, church and clergy are the true, natural custodians of moral behaviour. Men ask: "Would you want to live and rear your family in a community without these influences?" Later we shall ask this again.

Here I shall try to show the falsity and harm of this

theory and the social need for the true one. Hence I must sketch in minimum detail the story of the natural origins of both morality and religion. This will show their complete mutual independence and disclose in morality one characteristic so fundamentally dominating as to give it a full, clear primacy over religion in all their bearings upon human conduct.

At the close of the eighteenth century Immanuel Kant's great mind was intrigued by the fact of the universality of the idea of duty. "Duty," he exclaimed, "Wondrous thought! that workest neither by fond insinuation, flattery, nor by any threat, but merely by holding up thy naked law in the soul and so extorting always for thyself reverence,—Whence thy original?"

This call of duty upon man's obedience he named the "*Categorical Imperative*." Its violation is an offense against that universal monitor, Conscience. Kant phrased the application of his great imperative in two new ethical laws which greatly enriched the ethical world: (1) "So act that the maxim of thy will may at all times serve as a universal law." (2) "So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end, withal, and never as a means only."

Both these laws are purely social and Humanistic in form and application and reflect no form of supernaturalism. Previously Kant had overthrown all old supposed proofs of God's existence; now, unable to account otherwise for the universal presence of conscience and his Categorical Imperative, he used this universality as new proof of the existence of a God who had endowed mankind with this awe-inspiring attribute. For him conscience was God-given, innate, independent of experience, "*a priori*." Hence he held that man required a soul so that the God he conceived of might be able to bestow rewards and punishments upon the "free-will doers" of moral and immoral acts. Now we shall see how conscience originated in a perfectly natural

way—one which Kant's generation was unprepared to discover or understand.

THE NATURAL ORIGINS OF MORALITY: Kant's great mystery was to remain unsolved for another hundred years. Then all his ideas as to the *a priori* nature of his Categorical Imperative and the need for a theologicometaphysical basis for his moral philosophy, involving God, the soul and immortality to reward our acts and explain the origin of our feelings of duty, of right and wrong, went over-board before the shock upon cultured, educated minds when modern evolutionary ideas created and developed the new sciences of anthropology and sociology and recast biology, psychology and ethics.

In 1859 Darwin published his *Origin of Species*, established the principle of Evolution and overturned the world's ancient modes of thought. In 1874 he published his *Descent of Man*. Again his theme was the natural survival of the fittest—here in part applied to institutions: For a child to survive, a larger unit, the family, must first survive; for the family, the clan; then, in turn, the tribe, city, state, nation.

In the insect and animal worlds (ants, bees, beavers, wolves, wild cattle herds, apes) the social instincts had evolved out of a need for mutual aid, co-operations for the good of the swarm, the pack, the herd, the tribe—but this was quite mechanical: no morality, no sense of duty. Where most gregariousness, most co-operation and least friction, there was the most successful living. From the days when evolving ape-men approached the human stage all had to live together in sub-human relationships with wrongs, injustices, brutalities always present. Feelings of outrage, resentment, disgust, arose naturally and expressed themselves. How not then that conflict should arise between the stark realities of things as men found them and the contrasting, more idealistic conditions of the things of men's desires—the conditions of what "ought to be," the things people

"ought" or "ought not" to do—the things, acts or conditions that would have social approval and so be better or "right?"

Here with the growth of cave-man brains and minds came better discernment and judgments. Ideas of better and worse, of right and wrong, approval, disapproval, slowly emerged, found names and expressed themselves. What else could come out of all this but that ideas of values as to conduct must emerge naturally? But this is morality.

In the first five chapters of *The Descent of Man* Darwin showed that the family can survive only if mutual aid and co-operation develop and prevail within its limits. These call for development of feelings and habits of sympathy, patience, assistance, understanding, obligation, duty. The long period of childhood, increasing as the general intelligence increased, plays an outstanding part in the growth of parental and filial instincts and affections. Families thus most fully developed will be most likely to survive in struggles against families less so developed. Thus the social instincts expand and the social virtues are born.

Thus, then, ideas of good and bad, of right and wrong, of duty and obligation arose out of experience and are just as natural, simple, fundamental, original, in man's thinking as ideas of red, warmth or hunger. Otherwise such ideas could not exist for anyone, any more than could the idea of harmony for a man born deaf. A young child with no ideas of consequences has no idea of obligation or "ought"—no conscience. Its acts are without moral implications until it learns and understands the nature of consequences. Thus for family, for clan, for tribe, for state, the same law holds. Each of these which has its social instincts most highly developed will survive as against the less so developed of its class.

Darwin indicated the probability "that any animal whatever, endowed with well marked social instincts, (including) the parental and filial affections, would inevitably

acquire a moral sense or conscience, as soon as intellectual powers had become as well, or nearly as well, developed as in man." In detail he indicates: (1) The existence of mutual pleasure, sympathy and service within the group due to the presence of the social instinct. (2) The social instinct is "always present and enduring" among animals of advanced mentality; if this be overcome by some momentarily stronger but less vivid or less enduring instinct, reflection would bring about "that feeling of dissatisfaction or even misery which invariably results—from any unsatisfied instinct." One would "feel as if he had been baulked in following a present instinct or habit." (3) With language acquired and community opinion thus expressible, this "would naturally become in paramount degree the guide to action." (4) "The social instinct, together with sympathy, is, like any other instinct, greatly strengthened by habit, and so consequently would be obedience to the wishes and judgment of the community." (*Descent of Man*, chap 4.)

Again he tells us: "At the moment of action, man will no doubt be apt to follow the stronger impulse.—this—will more commonly lead him to gratify his own desires at the expense of other men. But after their gratification, when past and weaker impressions are judged by the ever-enduring social instinct, and by his deep regard for the good opinion of his fellows—he will—feel remorse, repentance, regret or shame;—He will consequently resolve more or less firmly to act differently for the future; and this is conscience; for conscience looks backward and serves as a guide for the future."

Darwin closes his chapter IV by saying he had "endeavored to show that the social instincts—the prime principle of man's constitution—with the aid of the intellectual powers and the effects of habit, naturally lead to the golden rule, 'As ye would that men should do to you, do ye to them likewise;' and this lies at the foundation of morality."

Thus Darwin not only grants the supremacy of con-

science on which Kant insisted, but he accounts fully for its purely naturalistic origin which Kant was never able to do. Thus the concepts of morals and morality, the ideas of right and wrong, the sense of duty and obligation were born naturally into the world. They were not handed down from the sky nor on Mount Sinai; they did not originate in religion; they evolved *pari passu* with ourselves and apply equally to all; and the science of ethics rests on this wholly natural base. If one fails to give due consideration to the consequences of his acts; if he be deficient in his recognition of social relationships, prove incapable of carrying on self-directing activities, it is up to society in its own defense to put him in his proper place and instruct him in social proprieties by all necessary means.

There are, of course, and probably always will be, millions of self-centered, untrained individuals, not yet rightly evolved mentally, morally, socially. These must be recognized by the more advanced and humanized members of society as the throw-backs they may prove themselves to be and dealt with by the most approved methods of the best psychologic, sociologic and ethical knowledge. Promises of rewards in the bye-and-bye instead of scientific understanding and handling here and now have been and would always be only an endless source of the world's current ills.

To eliminate any remaining doubt as to whether the mystery which proved too deep for Kant is now solved—whether the basing of the feeling of duty, of moral obligation, on the social instincts explains why they are obligations of unconditional authority—Darwin devoted much of his chapter V to showing that *for the group as a whole the social instincts constitute a survival element of the highest order*. Human survival depends upon men living together in groups and those groups have the best chance to survive which have the greatest number of intelligent, faithful, devoted, sympathetic socially-minded members. As other groups or tribes are absorbed and as intelligence increases, the field of opera-

tions of the social instincts expands until ultimately it embraces the whole world and with the extension of sympathy comes also to include the animal world in man's imperative "ought." In this development, increasing approval of socially beneficial acts and disapproval of their opposites plays a major part in the upbuilding of the sense of obligation. Thus not "The greatest happiness of the greatest number," as the Utilitarians framed it, but "to do good unto others—is the foundation stone of morality." (*Descent of Man*, p. 202.)

And Kropotkin in his *Mutual Aid, A Factor of Evolution* and in his *Ethics: Origin and Development*, emphasizes mutual aid as the great constructive factor in evolution, as supplanting within the group the struggle for existence which rules outside of and between groups and so as solving the problems of the origin and authority of the moral law. He tells us: "The function of ethics—is to act in the *positive* direction, by appealing to man's best instincts.—it appeals—to love, courage, fraternity, self-respect, accord with one's ideal. It tells man that if he desires to live a life in which all his forces, physical, intellectual, emotional may find a full exercise, he must once and forever abandon the idea that such a life is attainable on the path of disregard for others." (*Ethics: O and D*, p. 25.)

Society in its own defense approves or condemns men's acts, but in an impersonal way, taking account of conditions and circumstances but not of individuals as such. Hence that universality which so mystified Kant. For him the rightness or wrongness of an act was absolute. But there is no such thing as absolute morality. Human actions do not take place in a vacuum. Each act is followed by consequences affecting the lives and fortunes of the actor and others and its moral qualities are fixed by both intent and consequences. Kant's imperative of doing right for right's sake simply does not exist.

This is a brief account of the evidence now accepted in the intellectual world for a non-supernatural, human, evo-

lutionary theory of the origin and nature of man's moral senses. Thus a purely natural morality does exist, all independent of divine guidance—forced into being by the fact that without it livable human social relations (and with them man himself) could not have come into being. All matters as to morals, all problems as to the rightness and wrongness of men's acts in their mutual dealings, are covered by the science of ethics on a purely humanistic basis. Ethics has no concern whatever with any supposed relations of men with any hypothetical God, heaven or hell; that is the domain of theology, realm of assertion and speculation about legendary, mythical and hallucinatory constructs of the human imagination. God, heaven, hell no longer enter into the picture of the educated man's ethical problems. However, there are untold millions, even right here in the United States, whose minds are still bound by mediaeval religious ideas.

THE ORIGINS OF RELIGION: We follow the definition of religion as given above.

Religion began and evolved in a manner wholly different from that just shown to have taken place in the case of morals. Historians, anthropologists, monuments, inscriptions, folklore, mythology, study of primitive tribes, have given the world much light on primitive customs, cultures, religions; on rituals, beliefs, tabus. They have written many volumes, made and compared many theories and hypotheses bearing on man's mental processes, early and late. Out of it all rises a fairly substantial agreement of opinion that religion adherence to some sort of god-idea, originated in primitive days out of the mixed feelings of ignorance, awe, mystery, need and fear with which primitive man faced the world.

In tens of thousands of places men gathered to exchange experiences as ideas, words, meanings, improved. Movements of winds, clouds, sun, moon, tides, planets, storms,

rainbows, echoes, reflexions in water, sickness, deafness, epilepsy, the insane, dreams, the stillness of the dead—all had to be explained. There were stages of magic and fetishism in which various natural objects were credited with special power and viewed with awe, veneration and worship. Strange and unusual events were given the easy, mystic explanation as being the result of "spirit activities." Spiritism is always patterned after the causative powers of desire and will felt by each as internal to himself. Imaginatively he projects these into inanimate matter and empty space in attempts to account for non-understood, natural, causal relationships.

Men invented little spirits: fairies, pixies, gnomes, and little devils, imps, goblins; and bigger spirits presiding over the chase, the plantings, the harvests, animal breeding, war, the affections etc. Some were ancient heroes deified. Tabus were imposed on things that mustn't be touched, acts that mustn't be done, relations that mustn't be disturbed lest the spirits be offended. Certain rites were invented to pacify the watchful, invisible powers behind the veil. Certain places, objects, animals became sacred to these spirits, or holy. In those days ignorance of the world, of nature, of the human mind was universal and all minds credulous under the spell and sway of religion. All believed these supernatural powers existed and could be persuaded to give petitioners favorable attention up until slowly dawning intelligence and reason in the best of the minds began to detect contradictions and discovered illusions in religion's explanations.

Some tribes made their sacred animal a tribal symbol, a tribal totem—a deer, a tortoise, a bear. Sacredness soon called for sacrifice—a shedding of blood, the blood of the sacred animal itself, human blood. At sacrificial feasts the sacred animal itself came to be slain and eaten so as to confer on the participants the powers or benefits it carried. This custom still survives in the Christian communion service where wafers are eaten and wine is drunk as the body

and blood of Christ. According to Catholic teachings these are transmuted into his actual body and blood by the priestly officiation: more supernaturalism!

Behind, beyond, above all this, and patterned, as stated, on the consciousness of their own minds and wills, individuals created mentally a world mind and will, deemed necessary to keep activities activating. Ultimately this was conceived most naturally in form of the highest being known on earth—man, a big man, invisible, powerful, awesome, sacred or holy and persuadable according to the type of the petitioning mind. In some such age-long manner religion must have emerged on earth and expanded. From the wild, aboriginal, totem-eating, blood-drinking, child-sacrificing tribalists to the civilized, cathedral-housed, supernaturalistic believers in God and worshipers of Christ, and their pastors, priests and communion, all is one general pattern—Religion—devotion to the *man-created* idea of gods, or a God.

When man's god-devotion assumed the highly immoral form of sacrifice of living children and youth to the gods by fire (See Judges xi: 29-40; Jeremiah vii: 30, 31; Nehemiah x:34-36; Micah vi:7; Prescott: Conquest of Mexico 28,38-9) these minds were as truly and genuinely religious as the minds of those others who joined in the dedication of Solomon's temple. Perhaps the child-immolators may even be considered the most devout and religious of all as having offered the greatest sacrifices to the gods.

I have never known of anyone in any way trying to maintain the idea that religion possesses any (earthly) individual or group survival value, for it does not. Religion is itself a divisive factor in group life, as witness the some 200-plus Christian sects, plus the jews, Mohammedans, Parsis, Hindus etc. and their sects. Witness the bloody centuries of heresy hunting, inquisitions, religious warfare all over western Europe, (see chap. VII) or get the opinion of Jesus himself: "Think not that I am come to send peace

on earth: I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be those of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." (Matt. x.34-37) or again: "Suppose ye that I come to give peace on earth? I tell you Nay; but rather division. For from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter and the daughter against the mother; the mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law." (Luke xii: 51-53.)

Jesus was an inordinately religious man and in direct proportion to this seems to have been a correspondingly poor family man. Thus (—a disciple said to him) "Lord, suffer me to go and bury my father." Jesus replied: "Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead." (Matt viii: 21,-22) Another said: "Lord, I will follow thee; but let me first go bid them farewell which are at home at my house." And Jesus said: "No man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." (Luke ix: 59, 62,) Also Luke xiv:26 "If any man come to me and hate not his father, -mother, -wife, -children, -brethren, -sisters, yea, -his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." Jesus to his mother: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" (John ii: 3, 4) See also Luke xiv: 12-14.

MORALITY AND RELIGION

We have seen that Morality and Religion are both of natural origin. Morality, as a survival element, must needs have come first so that minds might emerge and survive to

invent (or not to invent) religion—for (repeating) the human mind, newly emerging and evolving from the brute-hood in which no god-idea had ever as yet existed, did this by projecting its own consciously existent, causative powers of desire and will into the outer world and personalizing them there.

Morality, therefore, holds priority over, and so must be absolutely independent of religion. With religion and the gods arising because primitive minds naturally made mistaken inferences as to the nature of the world, and, with endless difference and strife thus positively guaranteed, the more that men became divided by differences of opinion about the spirits and the gods, the more vitally important became the world-saving, socializing function of natural morality as it flowered out of the social instincts of brute-hood's days.

Here let us consider the Ten Commandments: The first four are not moralisms at all—merely orders allegedly given by a “self-confessed jealous God” (Exodus xx:5) to maintain his own primacy over gods (the Baalim) of neighboring tribes, and not always succeeding; or purely religious directives—sabbath-keeping. The other six: Honor your parents; Don’t kill; Don’t commit adultery; steal; lie; nor covet. These could not have been original to the days of Moses. They were not “God-revealed.” Written or unwritten they must have existed for some thousands of years in the advancing civilizations of Egypt, Babylonia, Sumer, Assyria.

As Darwin and Kropotkin have just taught us: such moralities arise out of natural, social, animal instincts; men’s natural and necessary morality. Without them neither society nor man could have survived and such nations and civilizations could not have evolved; nor even the human race itself. If Moses were the first to tabulate them, give him credit for that much and don’t drag in God. But can you conceive that Egypt’s advanced social structure into which Moses was born had no comparable laws, written or

unwritten) for sustaining social stability? Here, on the Commandments and out of the amazing co-operative activities (as alleged) of God and Moses and told in Exodus, I make the point and state my belief that THIS IS THE POINT WHERE THE PRIESTHOOD, IN THE NAME OF GOD AND THEIR RELIGION, REALLY TOOK OVER THE CUSTODY OF WESTERN MORALS.

Right here we note that slavery is recognized in the Tenth Commandment. Its correct translation would read "male slave" and "female slave" instead of "man servant" and "maid servant." Slaves were property like oxen; wives also were bought and sold openly. Half of the next chapter (Ex. xxi;) deals with rules for handling slaves and their wives and children—specifying when slave families may be broken up; all of it "The Word of God." (?)

In due succession, then, the hierarchies and the "church," as later organized, and the clergy, who work professionally with the Almighty over rewards for conduct and belief, have established themselves as the authoritative dispensers of moral instructions, as divinely accredited censors of men's moral derelictions and arbiters of moral awards and destinies—even to the extent of selling indulgences or permits to commit sins. Pay the clerical fee and escape the divine penalties! Religion's rewards and penalties, of course, are allegedly reserved for another world, except where religion finds it has enough earthly power to enforce its own decrees; then it does so without restraint as we shall soon see abundantly.

Next let us note that religion, with its origins in ignorance, fear, dependence and credulity, never prescribes the morals of a people. It accepts and supports such moralities and immoralities as locally and popularly prevail. When and where religion finds polygamy, slavery, subjection of women, it then and there has supported them. Churches in the United States were split North and South over the

slavery that led to our U. S. war of 1861-65. It was their moralistic Humanism, even among the religious, not their religion that finally killed slavery, despite the South's religion. The same is true today (1961) about "segregation" in New Orleans and most of the South.

The inspired religious mind that wrote Deuteronomy xiv: 21 didn't confuse religion with ethics nor obstruct business practice with morality. He told the Jews flatly: "Ye shall not eat of anything that dieth of itself; thou shalt give it to the stranger that is within thy gates, that he may eat it; or thou mayest sell it to an alien; for thou art a holy people unto the Lord thy God."

Here is another bible tale never widely publicized, that shows what extremes religion can reach even with a people as religious as the Jews have always been: Before 600 B. C. the Jews, "the children of Israel and the children of Judah —they, their kings, their princes, their priests and their prophets and the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem" abandoned their earlier God, Jehovah, and began to worship Baal. "They have built also the high places of Baal to burn their sons with fire for burnt offerings to Baal—" (again) "to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire—" (Jeremiah xxxii:31-35; xix:3-6; vii.30,31; Psalms CVI:36-38.)

These sacrifices were all religious rites with officiating priests. Jeremiah, prophet of Yahweh (Jehovah) and their earlier religion, and especially feeling a far different morality, was terribly opposed to all this. But it was his humanism, his social instincts, his natural morality (probably conceived as, or at any rate reported as, Jahweh's voice) and not any "divine revelation" that caused his protest.

Chapter 3 of Prescott's *History of the Conquest of Mexico* tells of child-sacrifices by the ancient priests as running in excess of 20,000 a year! Today India's 60,000,000 "untouchables" are religiously condemned and held as social

outcasts, birth to death! Yet in this 20th century, Hindu religionists, on religious grounds, strongly protested a constitutional change to relieve and rehabilitate these!

All the foregoing was Religion—service to the gods—directed and ordered by a priesthood and riding high-handed and rough-shod over morality, humanity, family affection and all normal social instincts!

From all such-like and more of the same the world is confused as to priorities and relationships as between morality and religion. The words, the ideas, are not interchangeable. Clearly the religionists have seized upon mankind's highest attributes, idealisms and either knowingly as a blind or screen for self-advantage or in simple belief that their activities are truly God-serving, have turned these social moralisms to institutional and personal advantage. The clergy steadfastly give the masses the idea that by joining *their* (the clergyman's) religious faith they are 1.) establishing themselves in the congregation of the righteous and respectable and 2.) assuring themselves eternal salvation.

I think it is never true that a person is good because he is religious; just the very reverse. No one was ever born religious. Always that is a matter of indoctrination, though many are born filled with the social instincts—born naturally amiable, friendly, kindly, helpful, loving fairness, justice, honesty, truth, and hating brutality and all the other opposites—in short, born good. Such is a large portion of the world's average mill-run of citizens under normal conditions. Individuals so endowed are ordinarily less suspicious, more credulous, conceiving the world to be more like their own nature. They easily become religious when so taught, and sincerely so—by simple acceptance of dogma, by emotional exploitation of youth's innocence, ignorance and inexperience, by being uncritical enough to believe that the emotions they experience represent the workings of some higher

power (which they name God) upon or through them—the God of whom the clergy talk and for whom they vouch. Thus it happens that they become miseducated into an acceptance of the illusions and falsehoods which are religion's stock in trade.

Once they surrender to its dogmas they have small capacity to free themselves from their power. Then they seem willing to rob themselves and all mankind of all credit for any native goodness and give that credit to God. In reality the only knowledge of goodness the world ever possessed originated in the minds and characters of clear-thinking, good-mannered, honest-minded, justice-loving persons—the noblest members of their species. Never was there any other source from which any knowledge of goodness could originate. From such persons these qualities were in due time transferred by the god-makers to their favorite gods, throwing upon mankind at large the burden of "original sin" as found in the mentally and morally unevolved or half-evolved semi-brutes some of whom will ever retain enough physical survival power to make themselves felt as a drag on the world.

To me it is unquestionable that if no one had ever conceived of the supernatural, of gods, spirits, devils, there would yet have been born millions of these kindly, friendly, sympathetic human beings—naturally indignant at injustices, oppressions, brutalities; naturally preferring truth to lies, decencies to indecencies, sense to nonsense. Such people with a minimum of ethical direction and an honest education as to the facts and laws of nature and the methods, discoveries and truths of the world of science, would have matured into a high class citizenry. Those with less responsive social instincts, with more stubborn, egoistic recalcitrance to social controls, would call for specialized training or complete segregation whenever rightly shown to be social menaces. Thus the world, safely guided by the indispensable natural morality of its social instincts would

have escaped religion (supernaturalism) and the false and mischievous things it has saddled upon the world.

My belief is that everyone desires and seeks to get the greatest value possible into (and out of) his own life. Always, I think, each lives his life the best way his individual but generally inadequate mind is able to judge and decide. And why otherwise? Is not this true of you and of your friends? Decent behaviour is a matter first of good inheritance, then of good education and training. Yet men's ideas of what is "best," and their knowledge or ignorance of the "how," take the measureless range we find in the world. Life is short, parents generally ignorant at best, education highly inadequate, experience often abrupt, shocking, irremediable; people are continually lied to or indirectly deceived about vitally important things, and so men judge values poorly, wrongly, often ruinously, and thus make terrible mistakes. Also badly-born, bull-headed egoists are not properly taken in hand. These are problems of education, sociology, ethics.

For religion and theology, though, these human errors, even though not social crimes, these planes of low living accepted by the world's underdeveloped, immature moral natures, are "sins against God" and, together with the terrible theological sin of doubt or disbelief in what the bible or the clergy tell them, carry with them the penalties of God's disfavor, ranging upward (for the simplest minded) to eternal damnation in hell; but, hopefully, a way of escape can be arranged-for conditionally by the priest.

Through the ages Religion's great stress has been upon Faith, upon belief in word of priest or "Word of God," asserting hundreds of things long since set aside by science and common sense as being * (1) physically impossible; (2) intellectually absurd; (3) socially destructive; (4) morally outrageous, (5) lunacies of the insane—many of them in two or more of these categories—also (in Christendom) upon

faith in Chirst as the Divine Son of God and Saviour-from-hell-fires of truly believing Christians—the rest being eternally damned (John iii:16-18; Mark xvi: 16; Acts iv:12) This is the low water mark of Christendom's immoralities.

The truth, however, is that religious faith is utterly unimportant except for its leading of mankind into wild, false, unbased beliefs, hopes, speculations. The only hope for the advancement of human knowledge and the material and moral progress of men depends rather upon the individual possession of a strong moral sense, including intellectual honesty, and upon faith in the success of intelligent inquiry into things as they appear or are reputed to be, where verification or close, logical reasoning from verifiable knowledge is possible. The faiths of science, which are almost illimitable, are faith built on precisely these latter conditions.

THIS SUBJECT IS CONTINUED UNDER TITLE:
MINDS, MORALS, RELIGION—Cap VII.

* For a few (of many) examples of these see for (1) Gen. vi; vii; viii; Ex xiv:22-29; Josh. x:12-14; II Kings ii:8-14; Luke xxiv:50-51; For (2) Gen. xi:1-9; Jonah 1:14-ii:10; Matt. xv:32-38; xviii:8-9; Mark xi:22-24; Luke xiv: 26,33; For (3) Matt. v:39-42; vi:25-34; xix:9-12; 18-24; James v:13-15; Acts ii:41-47; iv:31-v:10; For (4) Num. xxxi:7-18; 31-54; Deut. xvii:1-12; xx:10-17; xxi:18-21; Levit. xxv:44-46; Ex. xxi:2-6; xxxii:7-29; Matt. xxv:31-41; For (5) Revelation chap v to end.

CHAPTER III

A TRUTH-CARING PEOPLE

“—the foundation of morality is to have done, once and for all, with lying; to give up pretending to believe that for which there is no evidence, and repeating unintelligible propositions about things beyond the possibility of knowledge.” Thomas H. Huxley, *Science and Morals*.

“It belongs to the self-respect of intellect to pursue every tangle of thought to its final unravelment.” A. N. Whitehead.

The late E. W. (Ed) Howe, one time dean of American journalists, once collected some of his aphorisms in a small book, *Ventures in Common Sense*. For this Mr. H. L. Mencken wrote a 22-page introduction referring to Howe’s “rare quality of honesty—a quality, in fact, so seldom encountered in American writing that it would be stretching the truth but little to say that it is never encountered at all.”

Continuing, Mr. Mencken says: “Our Puritan culture—makes for many laudable virtues: enterprise, industry,—the fear of God,—a noble gratitude that we are not as other men are. But one of the things it does *not* * make for is that austere intellectual passion which exalts a bald fact above comfort, security and the revelation of God. —one of the things it does *not* promote is common truthfulness. (Mencken’s italics.) The American, indeed, always views the truth a bit suspiciously, particularly if it be a truth about himself and his: he seems convinced that it is dangerous

and perhaps downright indecent. In his philosophising he roams the superficial, leaping back almost blushingly every time his foot turns up the fundamental. It is always words that fetch him, not realities; he is the most abject slave of mellifluous and meaningless phrases—and since words and phrases, however lovely, have a way of failing when they are put to the test he forces himself into a sort of preposterous dualism. On the one side is the moony philosophy he serves with the lip; on the other side is the harsh, realistic, Philistine philosophy he really practices. On the one side is the ethic that meets the national notion of propriety; on the other side is the ethic that practically works. This disparity between what is publicly approved and what is privately done is at the heart of the Anglo-Saxon, and especially of American, character; it sets our people off from nearly all other peoples. It is the cause of the outstanding hypocrisy that foreigners always see in us—

“That hypocrisy, to the foreign eye, bathes the American scene—Thus the curious dualism of the land. No wonder foreigners stand amazed before the incredible contrast between our pretension and our practice.—

“What lies under all this, of course, is easy to see. The primary difficulty is that the American people, despite a century and a half of struggles for freedom, are still burdened by a crushing heritage of Puritanical pish-posh.—The second difficulty is to be found in the extraordinary timorousness, the pervasive intellectual cowardice, which Puritanism carries with it. The thing needed is obviously a thorough overhauling of the national code—perhaps its forthright abandonment and the formulation of a new one closer to the unescapable facts. But this is precisely what Americans seem least fitted for.”

Mr. Mencken expands upon Mr. Howe’s unique place in American letters as an absolutely honest and fearless man, saying: He represents “the man who discerns the realities in the mass of rumble-bumble, but is still a bit too timorous

to be articulate. Mr. Howe is that man with the timorousness thrown off." (**Ventures in Common Sense*: Introduction, A. A. Knopf)

These words by Mr. Mencken are but a small fraction of his challenging indictment of the American mind, character and philosophies of life in this context. They have been for years available to the American public, but if they have had any appreciable practical effect as intended, it will take an Einstein to discover it.

Again the American attitude toward truth has been brought onto the carpet by another American who is a mind expert. Dr. Harry Overstreet tells us:

"We have seen (1941) what Hitler's lies can do to a people and what they threaten to do to our world. There is no alternative for us: We Americans will have to get a new grip on truth—truth in business, truth in law, truth in politics, truth in education. In a multitude of unnoticed ways we have woven a social fabric with lies running through it. They do not strengthen the fabric.

"Our next job as a people will have to be to learn new respect for the truth, for only the truth attitude of a truth-caring people can make us strong." (*Our Free Minds*. p. 48).

Did Mr. Overstreet overlook "truth in religion?" I cannot conceive that he did not meditate on that desideratum also. Did this seem so far beyond the bounds of possible hope or expectation that the bare idea was preposterous? No. Search reveals that in an earlier book, *The Enduring Quest*, (1931), pp. 162-3, Mr. Overstreet met this by telling us:

"—Christianity, as an institutionalized religion, has laid no stress upon the pursuit of truth. Indeed, for the most part, it has been suspicious of the truth-seeking process. The truth-seeker might overturn accepted beliefs. Thus institutionalized Christianity (He might well have said 'Religion in general') has in the main been the foe of truth-for-its-own-sake. It has denied the first of the elementals."

(The three Elementals are Truth, Beauty, Goodness.)
Furthermore:

"It has also, in the main, been the foe of beauty-for-its-own-sake. Beauty has been regarded as too seductive for weak mortals.—It has denied the second of the Elementals." —"So it is a little precarious to defend goodness. Perhaps if we confess at the outset that goodness without truth and beauty is never really goodness at all, we shall be permitted to continue. Goodness is a special kind of truth and beauty. It is truth and beauty in human behaviour."

Can we of the United States, then, ever become "a truth-caring people?"

Whatever the doubt, I feel sure we shall never achieve this by clinging blindly, unreasoningly and in defiance of the results of the best modern scholarship, to outworn theological doctrines of soul-salvation through a "risen Redeemer" based on long-ago exploded legends of Genesis—the "Fall of Man," "Original Sin," and the mass-mind-produced, rumor-gathered "miracles" of the four Gospels, as practically all of our clericals continue to do. The higher, deeper, profounder analytical criticism of the Christian scriptures has advanced the world's biblical knowledge amazingly in the past two centuries.

THE POLYCHROME BIBLE: In the 1890's there was begun in Johns Hopkins University a full analytic study and exposition of the bible, book by book, by the greatest scholars of biblical literature of Europe and America. This was to be published, book by book, in separate volumes. In each book the different original portions, as written by or assembled from different writers in differing languages, in dialects or differing periods, were to be distinguished by printing their distinguishable parts in differing colors and/or type—one definite color for all portions coming from any one definite source—all under the title, Polychrome, (many-color) Bible. Did you ever see a copy? What became of it?

You may find copies of perhaps five to ten of these

volumes back in the reference sections of most first-class libraries but seldom in those of the smaller towns. The clergy rarely or never mention this set to their followers. Had they done so with a truth-seeker's, truth-finder's, enthusiasms it might well have sold enormously. But they have always handled it hugger-mugger with the laity so that as a publication enterprise or as a contribution to general public knowledge of the origins of the Christian scriptures the undertaking was a relative "flop" as compared with the publicity that Science gives to comparable scientific works—say those of Darwin. It's American publishers, answering my inquiry, said: "—it was not a profitable venture and—was discontinued long before it was completed.—there was quite a little interest in (it) among the more scientifically minded at the time of publication. But the response was by no means commensurate with the considerable investment involved."

The trouble was: The Polychrome Bible told too much truth about the bible—the last thing the mill-run, pulpитеering clergy, Protestant or Catholic, want; so they ignored it. These should well know that the Christian bible is a purely human document. But by tacit understanding they have given such products of high scholarship in their own domain, whether of the Old or New Testament, the "run-around" from their beginning *and still continue to do so, so far as their congregations are concerned*. Compare this with scientists' handling of the truths in *their* fields.

The book of Genesis was composed by not fewer than seven writers over a period from about 900 to 450 B. C.; the book of Judges is shown to be a composite from at least eight different sources covering a period of some 500 years from about the ninth century to the beginning of the fourth century B. C. The two differing Creation stories and the two differing Noah's Flood-and-Ark stories are no more historical than that of Cinderella. In its first nine chapters (to the long chapter on "begatting") Genesis contains by

count at least a hundred twenty statements which any competent group of scientists in the world would today pronounce false, wholly incredible, in the light of today's thoroughly established knowledge.

In Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers are more than seventy chapters of most minute details of commands and directives—orders claimed to be given by Almighty God himself: “The Lord said unto Moses” and to others, “Thou shalt” and “Thou shalt not’s”—including such vital matters as permission to eat locusts, beetles and grasshoppers (Levit. xi:22); “Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother’s milk.” (Exod. xxiii:19); instructions on how to offer sacrifice: “Then shalt thou kill the ram, and take of his blood, and put it upon the tip of the right ear of Aaron, and upon the tip of the right ear of his sons, and upon the thumb of their right hand, and upon the toe of their right foot, and sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about.” (Exod. xix:20) In Numbers v:11-31 “The Lord spake unto Moses,” giving highly interesting detailed directions for a trial to settle a serious question of delicate domestic relations—a plain case of barbaric ‘trial by ordeal,’ too long to quote here; but look it up and see how God makes judgments.

Although my chapter 4 is devoted to the incredible adventures of God, Moses and Pharaoh, it might be well in the present context to examine carefully Exod. xxiv:1,2,12-18; xxxii:15-28; xxxiv:1-28 (in this last, 14-26, is the second Ten Commandments which the Lord promised (xxxiv:1), would be “the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest.”) Compare them and see; then say (if you can) that you accept all this nonsense as true and the “Word of God,” and that “your” eternal God of the Universe did thus spend forty days and nights *twice over* triggering around pleasantly with this hot-tempered bloody butcher, Moses. Examine these references for yourself and see, now. If you accept, close my book now and pass it up.

Yet these fantastic “God-revealed truths,” from Genesis

i:1 on, are the basis of all Protestant "Fundamentalism" with millions of "true believers"—the Jehovah's Witnesses, the Four-Square Gospelers, the isolated Seventh-Day Adventists, the Christian Scientists, not to mention the Baptists, Methodists etc.

Truly enough we cannot deny the presence in the Christian bible of much fine literature, many profound truths, even though half buried in pages and pages of utter trash. But we might well post these blazing placards on our walls:

THE BIBLE OR THE TRUTH—WHICH?

You Can't Have Both.

**THE CHRIST-REDEEMER-SAVIOUR MYTH OR THE
TRUTH—WHICH?**

You Can't Have Both.

A principle, long fundamental in the writing and criticism of history, is that *miraculous doings are always to be rejected*. Apply this test to the bible miracles. These are the basis of the great bulk of men's religious activities. They are all "pishposh." If one be so minded as to be misled by them, I consider it "too bad," but his own affair. But where would modern science and the advance it has brought the world be today if it had tried to operate on the basis of such a tissue of concealment, unreality and falsehood as underlies the teachings of the clergy and their religion?

Here we may note that religion is not the product of evidence, logic and reason. It is a compound of emotion (generally or always fear in part) with the utterly unbased assumption that mind (God's) exists in the universe apart from a highly complex protoplasmic base such as constitutes the brains and nerves of organic beings. There has never been the slightest evidence that this is a possibility. Thus religion proceeds completely apart from considerations of reason and natural causation.

Luther could accept Joshua's biblical stopping of sun and moon in the heavens (Josh. x:12-14) but he couldn't

accept the factual astronomy of Copernicus. That would have wrecked his theological premise that the bible is God's Word, and he had to preserve that at any cost. Here Luther's morals are shown as above par by his fight against the Catholic racket of "Indulgences," but his religion put him below par when he subordinated the natural facts of astronomy, scientifically determined by careful observation and close reasoning, to the scriptural authority of "revealed religion." Such a one is a thorough-going representative of the clerical, religious type of mind.

But one can live up to only the type of mind he currently has. If this doesn't conform to the type you think he should have, there is little or nothing a lone individual can do about it. But the religious temperamentals should not be allowed to continue to dominate so largely the thought, education and activities of the rest of the world as it has done and still does. To this end I am seeking the attention of minds of a scientific bent which can recognize and reject falsehoods more readily and appreciate and respond to a call made on a basis of scientific approach and of humanistic values and interest. If today we say to the world: "Stop lying!" it will have small effect so long as religion dominates the world with tales of a personal God who answers prayers by over-riding natural causation. For the "ministers of God" will continue to delude the ignorant and credulous with their falsehoods and hypocrisies—especially the falsehood that the bible is the "Word of God," which they should be ashamed to make. There are chapters and chapters they would not dare read to their congregations.

And the bible houses, private enterprises not in business for their health, will continue to pour forth bibles by the tens of thousands in every language (at low prices and give-aways), every bible paid for by funds which the Bible-, Missionary- and Gideon-Societies (or groups) continue to collect from warm-hearted, simple-minded, emotionally

dominated True Believers. These know no simpler nor better nor less mentally difficult way to make a gesture of helpfulness to a world of souls on the way to hell.

How shall the world be able to "learn a new respect for the truth" while the clericals, self-appointed custodians of the world's moral well-being, base their entire program on false premises, false doctrines and defiance of the world's highest scholarship, while positively active opposition is steadily maintained by press and radio against all who dissent from the creeds of the churches and while suppression of open discussion of religion and its premises is the order of the day? Every "iron curtain" is a sign of something that can't stand the light of day. That a physical, historical, economic, moral, religious or other social fact or truth—or beliefs or discussions bearing on our knowledge of them—should be suppressed is a crime against the human mind and the social order. Out of free discussions of beliefs of any sort mental clarity will increase for all.

Suppressions do not arise out of the suppressors' interests in society's well-being but in some personal, family, group or class advantage that results from and is maintained by the suppression. Always suppressions betray fear or greed or lust for place or power or easy money on the suppressor's part. Always some unfair advantage is to be acquired or maintained by the suppressor; always the price paid is continuing ignorance on the part of the mass mind.

That, indeed, is the intent of suppression by religion's promoters. But *they* at all times have free rein to promote their falsifications and an especially clear radio field every Sunday when at any moment one can hear any of several religious broadcasts—some of them the most imbecile and outrageous doctrines of prophecy and hell-fire—poured into the air with not a chance for science, sanity or reason to voice a reply!

This situation exists only because the world's prevailing ignorance and enduring credulity are supplemented by the

religiously promoted falsehood that morality is somehow naturally bound in with religion; by the natural reluctance of the better informed to introduce controversy and recriminations into their own lives and by fears of press, radio, cinema, publishers and business of reprisals and boycotts directed by the organized beneficiaries of this promoted superstition and sustained mass ignorance.

Religion's chief headache today is that its falsity becomes progressively exposed as general enlightenment proceeds. The strenuous efforts of religionists to suppress discussion and to control education is full proof of their own certainty of how badly they would fare should enlightenment come. The proper remedy is not "Back to Religion," nor to give Religion any foothold in the schools, but to separate them wholly; then put professionally trained teachers of ethical standards, methods and practices in charge of the moral instruction of our children in our schools.

With all biology texts based on evolution, all geology giving evidence that Noah's Flood tales are nonsense, all modern physics and astronomy demonstrating the absurdity of the Joshua-and-sun story (Josh. x:12-14), of the heavenly ascent of Elijah (2 Kings ii:11), of Christ (Luke xxiv:51) and now (1950) of Mary; with all encyclopedias except the Catholic supporting the positions of science, how expect high school and college youth to respect a morality tied in with such falsehoods or believe Christianity's fundamental dogma of salvation by the blood of Jesus from "original sin" caused by the "Fall of Adam" (Gen. iii; Rom. v:12-21) who never "fell" because he never existed?

How long must the world of science stand for this endless suppression and permit Religion's propagandists and material beneficiaries to continue to "get away with" their utterly false (and still badly understood and badly interpreted) claim that Religion is the true and proper custodian of the world's morality?

There are two kinds of education: (1) That of science and the laboratories plus the Humanities of our secular colleges and universities. This we need not describe. (2) That of religion and the bible, including (a) the established seminaries (where the unwritten law is: Be "discreet" or withdraw.) and (b) The random "speculative" bible schools. Here the method is to "prove" matters of fact by quoting bible texts—quite regardless of their contexts—and by bringing in the "unquestionable," insuperable "Power of God" to overcome any and all difficulties that may hamper this sort of "proof." Repeatedly the bible-text proofs in difficult cases (Joshua, Jonah, Noah) are saved by what the colored preacher called the passing of a God's miracle.

As I write I have before me:

The Lake of Fire: Four "terrible" radio sermons on *Hell Fire* preached on consecutive Sunday mornings to a "radio Bible Class—over the full network of the Mutual Broadcasting System and by short wave around the world." This preacher professes his belief in practically every scriptural doctrine that persons of educated intelligence and culture, the general consensus of scientific opinion and world scholarship reject—including belief in "the infallible, verbal inspiration of the bible." He offers a list of seven books and thirty booklets, all his own, for sale. Voluntary mail contributions support this and many similar radio ventures.

(2) Two differing 32-page booklets, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ inches, issued by a western bible institute broadcasting thrice weekly on MBC (KHJ in Los Angeles) and teaching classes, chiefly adolescents, in a regular school. These booklets give bible-text explanations to questioning bible students; one deals with the "more difficult" bible problems: Creation, Evolution, Noah, Jonah, Joshua, the Virgin Birth, etc. All these are easily solved by quoting bible texts and more of "God's miracles."

(3) A 64-page $4\frac{1}{2} \times 7$ -inch booklet which proceeds to demolish Evolution by biblical texts in connection with

some still unsolved problems. This is a Watchtower (Jehovah's Witnesses) publication, ancillary to their two magazines (four issues monthly) issued "in several languages, in many nations and distribution totals millions monthly." These are sold on the streets by devotees who give their time gladly (and at times fiercely with hell-fire threats against skeptics) to this promotion.

(4) A 32-page, 4½x7-inch booklet, *Will Religion Meet the World Crisis?* from the same Watchtower source. Here the writer uses twelve texts from seven Old Testament books and twenty-eight from twelve New Testament books to prove (a) All Christian clergy "have turned traitor to God's Kingdom" and "are the adulterous bedmates of the politicians of this world." (p. 15, 16) (b) He counts the "Seven times" (7x360? see 5 below) from the Fall of Jerusalem, 607 B.C. and gets 1914 A.D., World War I year. Thus the Day of Armageddon approaches. (c) Then (Matt. xxv:31-46; Rev. xvii) God "will solve the international problems and world crisis by one irresistible stroke": (pp. 26, 27) "The clergy of Christendom" (and their followers) will "fall into the ditch of destruction at Armageddon." (p. 29) God's Kingdom with Christ as king will take over. "This kingdom is the only means of salvation." Jehovah's Witnesses representing the one true faith will alone be saved!

This booklet advertises a 352-page book, *What Has Religion Done For Mankind?* at 50c which may be had at any of 69 branch offices in 69 foreign countries and Watchtower Headquarters in the U.S. Here one sees True Believers in real action. Can Science plus sanity overtake it?

(5) A 24-page, 6¼x9-inch booklet, *The United States in Prophecy*, which triumphantly "proves," by 138 O. T. and 10 N. T. bible-text references, that when God anciently was talking about the House of Israel he really was meaning Great Britain (Ephraim) and the United States (Manasseh), sons of Joseph, son of Jacob (Israel). These two (Gen. xlvi:15-19) got the birthright and prophetic blessing but

because they disobeyed God he punished them "seven times more for your sins" (Levit. xxvi:13-28) by sending them (the northern; "lost," ten tribes of Israel) as captives to Assyria in 721 B.C. for ($7 \times 360 = 2520$) years. Counting from 721 B. C. (instead of the 607 in 4 above) we get 1800 A. D., the period when the U. S. A. came into being. This clearly proves WE ARE IT, for (Gen. xxxv:9-12) "a nation (the U. S. A.) and a company of nations (Great Britain) shall be of thee." See?

This prophecy expert offers a free magazine and is on the air analyzing "today's news with (his) prophecies. Heard thru the—entire nation."

(6) The March and April (1953) issues of a News Magazine of a group with "worldwide radio ministry" and giving "three free correspondence courses in religion." These two copies list by name 199 donors of funds from 31 states, the D. C. and 6 foreign lands, given in the names of deceased relatives. The March copy reports for 1952 "an average of 14,000 contributors each month." An enclosed slip suggests remittances of from \$2.00 to \$8,000. This is a 'Prophecy' cult.

(7) Sermons by Billy Graham and some blank checks received at intervals from Billy's headquarters with suggested sums up to \$100 as acceptable as fill-ins for the checks.

Much as Billy Sunday, his prototype of forty-odd years ago, flouted and reviled the world-wide consensus of scholarly opinion of scientists on geology, biology, anthropology, ethnology, psychology, evolution and of world experts on biblical knowledge—so is Billy Graham now holding forth as a world-wide religious leader and popular teacher with an equally insolent parade of abysmal ignorance of or indifference to those same thoroughly established, basic commonplace facts and truths of science and biblical research, discovery and analysis. The only advance in the

Billy Graham technique over that of Billy Sunday is that Graham avoids the coarse vulgarity which popularized the Billy Sunday brand of appeal. Graham has not yet to my knowledge stood at the front edge of his rostrum and, with violent gestures and naming of names, plunged the world's topmost evolutionary scientists "into hell" as Sunday did.

It is bad enough to have the mass-mind indifferent to what is true in the world—millions unable or unwilling to become informed on the basic facts of life, history and letters as disclosed by the open, competitive, earnest labors of truth-seeking scientists, historians and critics. But it is immeasurably worse when would-be leaders of mass thought and action are unable or unwilling so to inform themselves; or who, if and when informed, lack the stamina to tell their followers the truth. When men are duly educated and rightly qualified to become teachers and leaders of the masses, it becomes a matter of intellectual honesty and social duty for them to do their utmost to popularize the submerged facts and truths of life, of history, of science, which the mass-mind so sorely needs.

If in these respects Billy Graham is not qualified for educational leadership, for guidance of the mass-mind, by what right does he set himself up as a leader and guide with no explanation of or apology for his incompetence in the eyes of the whole intellectual and cultural world? We require public examinations of doctors, lawyers, teachers, nurses, even of barbers, who take the general public as clients. Ought not there be a corresponding and proper certification of the competence of religious leaders so that they may not go unchallenged into the open places of the world as professional teachers and guides to ignorant, information-hungry human beings, there to flout the well established conclusions of science the while they draw sustenance from the unwitting victims of their malpractices?

This world is conclusively established throughout the

world of science as an evolutionary product of Nature's matter and its properties. It had no "Beginning" because to have had a "real First Beginning" would have required a previous state of utter Nothingness. But out of Nothingness could have come only Nothing. The fact that you and I are now here proves *there never* was a Nothingness. *Thus, with never any Nothingness.* Thus no "First Beginning" could ever have been possible, so Matter and all its natural properties must be Eternal. Their evolutionary changes, such as operate today, account for today's world.

Mankind arose through hundreds of millions of years of evolutionary advance from the lowest and through the rising forms of life. Even today millions have not yet quite "made it," or have only barely made it to the human estate. We have no right to speak of any "First Man." There never was any "Adam and Eve"; no "Original Sin" or "Fall of Man" requiring the sacrifice of a "Son of God" to save man from hell-fires that God is reputed to have prepared for the punishment of all the generations of Adam's unborn descendants because Adam ate of "forbidden fruit." This thought, too, should jolt your ideas of a "just and loving Heavenly Father."

All these things, and a vast amount of other biblical lore, are just exploded bible myths, legends, fables wholly discredited as factual by the conclusions of the world's greatest and most careful scholars. Our encyclopedias and libraries overflow with the accumulated evidence that what science teaches the world is the product of the world's most competent and competitive thinking, without concealment, restriction or compulsion other than that set by the conditions and facts of nature itself.

The whole foundation upon which the Christian religion was based and on which it still rests is a collection of falsehoods, impossibilities and absurdities which its leaders are continually making great efforts to conceal by thought-

suppression, promotion of ignorance, intimidation and plain false propaganda.

Both our Billys prospered definitely by continued misleading of the faith, simplicity and ignorance of their emotionally-blinded True-Believer followers as they preached and taught these long since intellectually discredited religious traditions. They vouched for and promoted the exploded myths, legends and fables of Genesis as veritable facts and truths because they are "The Word of God"—are in the bible. In *their* schools these ancient guesses, errors, falsehoods are truths, "God-given," to guide men's acts and shape their lives. Their failures to meet the tests of earnest factual search and of intellectual honesty in their presentation of what is actually known are characteristic of the religious temperament and leadership of the world as contrasted with the attitudes of the men of science. They gave the world only added illustration of Religion's indifference to fact, truth and reality—of the intellectual dishonesty shown by the silent acquiescence of such of the clergy as may rightly be regarded as "informed" on the results of modern research.

Furthermore, we see the active assistance and co-operation in the gigantic fraud by the great majority of the press, radio and publishing houses. Why must so many purveyors of information flee in panic from great opportunities to present the facts and truths of science and scholarship to the starving, ignorant minds of the masses?

* * *

THE GOD-IDEA OVER EDUCATION

How think we could have become a truth-caring people when from earliest Puritan days to the recent past, and still widely, our religious leaders have seen to it that any who questioned the accuracy or inspiration of the bible or the

truth of its miracles or did not go to church was denied a place on our teaching forces? This condition still persists widely in rural places and in the South and in all denominational schools and colleges—especially the Catholics, always the most highly reactionary in matters of education.

Supporting his Church's stubborn mediaevalism over education, over religion and many social and domestic relationships, Pope Pius X, in his notorious Encyclical letter of 1907 against Modernism, told the world:

"Anyone who in any way is found to be tainted with Modernism is to be excluded without compunction from these offices (of directors and professors of Catholic seminaries and universities) whether of government or of teaching, and those who already occupy them are to be removed. The same policy is to be adopted toward all those who openly or secretly lend countenance to modernism—(or) show love of novelty in history, archaeology or biblical exegesis."

Thus, to bind uncultured minds to an antiquated God-idea by which it retains power over men's minds, the Catholic Church sets up anti-modernistic stone walls across the paths of intellectual advance. It is monstrous to misguide human minds or to suppress their activity in the difficult search for what is true and rightly believable. This church stopped Copernicus's clock in 1616. From then until 1835, *two hundred nineteen years*, no Catholic layman might read his story of a sun-circling earth. What TRUTH-LOVING ZEAL!

* * *

BRYAN, THE CLERICALS AND THE SCOPES "MONKEY TRIAL."

Just as against Copernicus, so a religious war (still going on) has been fought against evolution. This, too, contradicts "God's Word." Here now we match Billy Sunday's and Billy Graham's flouting of "the consensus of scholarship"

with Wm. J. (Billy) Bryan's mental degradation at the famous Dayton, Tennessee trial in 1925.

These episodes were staged by religionists for the glory of God, the bible and Christianity, and probably approved by ninety percent or more of the Protestant clergy; from whom I know of no recorded protests.

John Scopes was on trial for having violated a Tennessee law against teaching evolution in the public schools. Bills to be made law are generally put into legislative hands by interested persons who know just what they want. Those who fathered this law were the religious leaders of Tennessee. It would stall off an undermining of their influence by stopping a general spread of public knowledge of the true history of life on earth. That would expose the mythical nature of their biblical tales of Creation and cast doubt on their religious credentials.

Bryan, twice candidate and once nominated for the Presidency of the United States, came to Dayton to help the prosecution; perhaps to gain some of the abundant mass applause. He made an 8,000-word court speech which induced the judge to exclude some 38,000 words of evidence (later used in appeal) offered by the defense by eight scientists from such institutions as the state universities of Missouri and New Jersey, Harvard, Johns Hopkins and the University of Chicago—specialists as to the nature of and evidence for evolution.

Mr. Bryan, cross-examined openly by Clarence Darrow, abandoned all rules of evidence, inference, logic and reason and, seemingly unconscious that there is any consensus of world scholarship as to the scientific facts involved, completely scuttled (as far as in his power) the dignity of the human intellect. He admitted he believed the bible stories of Creation, of Adam's rib, the Tower of Babel, Noah's Ark and Flood, Jonah and the "Whale," Joshua stopping the sun and moon. He knew nothing of ancient civilizations except that "they would not run back beyond the creation,

according to the bible, 6,000 years." He was "not so much interested" in the age of earth or man or "how long the animals have been here."

Darrow: "You have never made any investigation to find out?"

Bryan: "No sir, I have never."

Such was the mind, with that of the judge (another religious man), that blocked the testimony of eight life-long scientific experts of highest calibre and competence on the subject under controversy.

Scopes was convicted. The judge fined him \$100. A higher court said the judge had no right to set such a fine and sent the case back for retrial. The local prosecutor threw it out of court. So it ended. The people of Tennessee still may not have their children taught the truths of biology common in all modern texts and known in intelligent circles all over the world.

Thus ever Religion, finding itself in power, proceeds to shackle the minds which question its "God-revealed knowledge" and "God-supported power." Neither Mr. Sunday, Mr. Bryan, nor their cheering supporters, clerical or lay, ever could have possessed that genuine scientists' "passion for dividing what is false from what is true." Did not the vast body of approving and co-operating Protestant clergy in both these cases share equally in the intellectual degradation and moral abasement of these episodes? Is it thus the United States is to become "a truth-caring people"?

Many are losing moral anchorage because they find the moral sanctions on which they were taught to depend are not based on truth and because clerical obscurantism has kept them from learning what the real sanctions of morality are.

On October 23, 1947, the press quoted Chancelor Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago as "claiming that moral education has failed in America." This after prac-

tically unrestricted domination of our moral life by clerics, churches and bible from before the days of Plymouth Rock.

The Chancelor said: "Civilization appears to be doomed unless the hearts and minds of men can be changed, and this is the task of civilization. The change is a moral, intellectual and spiritual reformation, so deep and drastic as to be called a revolution throughout the world." (Compare this with Mr. Mencken's words: Noting that "The Chancelor headed a committee which recently published a report on the American press," the dispatch closed with Hutchins' statement that "most anything anybody says about the American press would be justified."

If once we could get America to become "a truth-caring people" as Dr. Overstreet pleads, that should be sufficient moral reform to satisfy the first *century* of effort. As that developed, all other elements of moral conduct would proceed to fall into proper place almost automatically; but with church and clergy standing firmly for a program based on falsehoods and unreason and a press firmly supporting them, the outlook is dim indeed. I hold it within fair reason to say and so I deliberately maintain, that no other class has done more to suppress, distort, misinterpret and misrepresent the truth than the clergy. This followed necessarily from their determination, sincere or otherwise, to force the whole world of fact to conform to their God-idea and to the alleged biblical "revelations of truth" and the doctrines issuing therefrom. Here again we may well quote Mr. Lecky with approval:

"Until the seventeenth century, every mental disposition which philosophy pronounces to be essential to legitimate research was almost uniformly branded as a sin, and a large proportion of the most deadly intellectual vices were deliberately inculcated as virtues. It was a sin to doubt the opinions that had been instilled in childhood before they were examined; it was a virtue to hold them with unwaver-

ing, unreasoning credulity. It was a sin to notice and develop to its full consequences every objection to those opinions; it was a virtue to stifle every objection as a suggestion of the devil. It was sinful to study with equal attention—the writings on both sides, sinful to resolve to follow the light of evidence wherever it might lead—In a word, *there is scarcely a disposition that marks the love of abstract truth, and scarcely a rule which reason teaches as essential for its attainment that theologians did not stigmatize as offensive to the Almighty.* (my emphasis. F.E.) By destroying (books)—(spreading) a spirit of boundless credulity,—by persecuting with atrocious cruelty—they succeeded (for long) in almost arresting the action of the European mind, and in persuading men that a critical, impartial and inquiring spirit was the worst form of vice.” (*Rise of Rationalism*, vol. ii:90, 91)

It was only with the slow and (under the circumstances) difficult advance of the rationalistic spirit of tolerance, inquiry and truth-seeking that these conditions began to weaken and fall away. But they persist in full flower today in the strongholds of Catholicism and Protestant Fundamentalism. As late as 1947 Mr. Joseph McCabe came out with the documentary proofs in a volume of 30,000 words, “*The Lies and Fallacies of the Encyclopedia Britannica*, showing that its then latest edition had been systematically falsified (“emasculated”) in its references to and treatment of the Catholic Church, its history and record. As to who or what might be responsible for this situation the reader is entitled to one guess. But is it on bases such as the foregoing that we are to place confidence in the clergy as leaders and guides of the moral forces of the world and controllers of world education? Is it thus we are to develop the spirit of “a truth-caring people?” Since 1947, and for its latest edition, Britannica has passed into the charge of the University of Chicago and associates.

To know and to be able to speak freely the truth about these things is vastly more important to the world than all the mythical stories of virgin birth, a risen, ascended Christ and a God of Love who hides so well all evidence of his affection, as Cardinal Newman so well attested in his *Apology*, chap. v.

The moral (if any) is that no one should look to devotees of the God-idea for demonstrations of truth. Minds moved by claims of "Divine Revelation" are by that fact closed to propositions that threaten their mystic communion. They refuse to take interest in impartial investigations of the bases of their beliefs. If, then, the world could replace the false concepts of religion and its dominating God-idea by the concept of A Truth Attitude of a Truth-Caring People, at once there would be a vast improvement in the individual's and the world's social perspectives and a great, necessary initiatory step toward making the world in reality a Truth-Caring World.

Then let all "Free Thinkers" (Agnostics, Atheists, Ethical-Culturists, Free-Thinkers 'proper', Humanists, Liberals, Rationalists, Secularists—frankly announce themselves as "anti-supernatural" and, on the basis of an evolutionary, deterministic philosophy of the world, deliberately set about a "long term" take-over from church, clergy and religion and a promotion of re-education for the world on a basis of Respect for the Truth. This, Huxley assures us, is THE FOUNDATION OF MORALITY—and he is right.

Right here it is strictly to the point to quote the words of the late Knight Dunlap, late Professor of Psychology, University of California at Los Angeles: "The task for religion in the future, in respect to morals, seems to be not leading progress, but co-operating with other agencies until those other agencies are able to carry on alone." From his *Religion: Its Function in Human Life.* (1946), page 297.

Religionists' crimes against fact, truth, education and

the general educational advance of the world have been amply covered in Andrew D. White's monumental work: *The History of the Conflict of Science with Theology in Christendom*.

* * *

PURPOSE IN LIFE? In general I find no "Purpose in Life." Each individual must accept his own destiny according to his talents by heredity and the total impact of his environment. Of these the first are wholly and the second is mostly out of his control. He either will be without dominating purpose and so will drift or will have such purpose as results from interaction of these two factors. His purpose may lie anywhere from banditry to tennis or chess, in commerce, finance, research, devotion to his gods, medical missionarying, philosophical propagandizing.

Especially fortunate is he who has been made highly conscious of, or fairly sickened at, the endless burden of the world's ignorance and of the endless hordes of liars who, with more or less conscious deliberation and for personal profit, devote their energies, acts and lies to taking advantage of that ignorance. Fortunate, I say, is one thus conscious if, in consequence of such awakening experience, he has been led to devote his own life energies to the struggle against the ignorance, the lies and the liars. Thus he may discover a purpose and attain to a devotion toward making earth, here, now, a more decently habitable place for all men.

Such a person, moved deterministically by his philosophy, will then be able to proceed as a consciously causative agent optimistically promoting his faith and gathering new recruits to his standard of TRUTH ABOVE ALL ELSE. By how much the truth prevails the domain of ignorance and lies must shrink. And no truth is worthy the name which cannot maintain its place in open combat in the lights of logic, reason and established and verified facts.

For anyone seeking a Purpose in Life I know of no

higher or worthier one than that he should enlist for a lifetime of service in the crusade against ignorance and falsehood. Help make men who lie become rightly conscious that thus they are liars—a thing they would angrily resent if so charged directly by another. For all such Purpose-Seekers the world is an immeasurable field. In it they will find opportunity, fellowship and co-operation in the ranks and under the banner of FREE THOUGHT in one or more of its many organized forms as noted above.

CHAPTER IV

WANTED, AN ANSWER

I had practically finished with this short, sharp turn in my work when a picture and story in my newspaper (March 1, 1961) emphasized the vital importance of a question I was just then asking of my readers. I had told them that from this point on I shall be much concerned with religion, more especially with the Christian religion; also with its origins and its main support: the Christian Bible, generally regarded as and called: The Word of God. As there are about 50 "Holy Books" in the world, all claiming divine inspiration or origin we should have some information on when and how this "Word" got from God into its now assembled, printed and bound form(?)

My newspaper picture showed a pair of down-cast Jehovah Witnesses, parents who had been over-ruled by a New Jersey judge and deprived of the custody of their 3½-year-old son having a congenital heart ailment and who needed a blood transfusion. They had refused to permit this and quoted the Bible as being against it. "The child died only hours after (the) court had ordered him transferred to the hospital for emergency care."

Had these parents known as much of the answer to the above question as I shall try to tell you here, they might well not have had to lose their son.

In the past 300 years or so many of the greatest scholars

of Europe and America have given their life-times to devoted research on this question—have written many, many books telling and comparing their discoveries and conclusions. Here I can set forth only hints as to methods and results. For interesting and informative details I can only refer the reader to perhaps the most comprehensive, readable, authoritative, credible, brief summary of the answers to this question. That would be under the article *Bible* in the latest edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica. This work, after passing through 14 editions, was taken over by the University of Chicago in 1947 and now (copyright 1960) is published with the editorial advice and collaboration of the faculties of the University of Chicago and a committee of the members of the faculties of Oxford, Cambridge and London universities. In volume 3, an article, *Bible*, begins on page 502 and occupies 39 pages with what may be considered an expanded answer to the question I have asked above.

The Israelites' exodus from Egypt was between 1491 and 1270 B.C. (The older date favored) The story floated as oral tradition for some 400 to 500 years. All early dates are very uncertain—some by 100 years or more.

The first six books of the Bible: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, are called the Hexateuch. As these form a basis from which all the rest of the Bible naturally follows and on which it depends, I am limiting my interest and activity to that portion alone as being sufficient for my purposes in the present book. The Hexateuch is a mixture of several strands of ancient Hebrew tradition bearing on the origin and early history of the Israelites. The oldest strand was put into writing in the 10th or 9th century B. C. by a prophet in Judah who always speaks of God as Yahweh (Jehovah); hence this document is always called J for short.

Another writer in northern Israel gave his version of the traditions in the north. He called God Elohim (Hebrew,

Gods). His work is labeled E. J was long considered older than E but later studies show E may be the older. J and E cover much of the same ground. They are near parallel yet somewhat divergent accounts of the same events.

Again later, after the Northern Kingdom fell (722 B. C.) a prophet of Judah combined parts of J and E. This with additions of his own became JE.

Still later (7th century B. C.) JE was "enlarged by—the discourses of Deuteronomy." (D), discovered in 621 B. C. (II Kings xxii:10)

Throughout the Hexateuch occur Priestly sections, later yet than J, E, and D; "apparently the work of a school of priests." Their work is labeled P. They worked over "the narrative extending from creation to the settlement in Canaan—completed their work during the century following the restoration" (537 B. C.). Not long after P was completed the whole—JE and Deuteronomy, were combined with J; and the existing Hexateuch was produced.

P's picture of the Hosaic age represents the priestly ideal of the past rather than the past as it really occurred.

* * *

In order that the reader may have some idea of the extent and relationships of these "strands" of Hebrew tradition we give the following listing from the Encyclopedia Britannica, as printed and copyrighted in 1960, for each to study and use as he may desire:

The strand J comprises in part: Gen. ii,4b—iii,24; Gen. iv; the flood, parts of Gen. vi-viii; xi, 1-9; Gen. xii, xiii, xviii—xix., xxiv. xxvii. 1—45; xl., xlii.; Ex. iv—v (mostly); viii., 20—ix.7; x.1—xi; xxxiii.12—xxx.v.24; Num.x.29—36; most of Num.xl.

The strand E: First traces in Life of Abraham in parts of Gen. xv—also more in Gen. xx. 1—17; xxi: 8—32; xxii. 1—14; xl.—xlvi and xlvi (except a few isolated passages); Ex. xviii.20—23 (including the Decalog—in its original terse form without the explanatory additions—and the collec-

tion of laws,—the “Book of the Covenant,” in xxi—xxiii) xxxii, xxxiii. 7—11; Ex. xxxiv. 17—26; Num. xii; most of Num. xxii—xxiv; Josh. xxiv.

The strand JE as stated above (about 722 B. C.) is mostly from J and E with additions of its own and is mostly prophetical.

Deuteronomy is mostly the strand JE, enlarged, probably in the 7th century B. C. The Deuteronomist sets forth “—the fundamental principles of Moses,—the sole God-head of Yahweh—His choice of Israel—frees it from slavery and (leading it to Canaan).” In xii—xxvi Deut. uses much JE; also in Joshua, Judges and Kings.

In 586 B. C. the Judahites were carried captive to Babylon where they remained until 444 B. C. During and following this captivity the Priestly code (P) was produced and the JE and D codes were combined, with additions, into JED.—“—examples of passages from P—Gen. i.1—ii.4a; xvii; xxiii; xxv.7—17; xlvi.6—27; Ex. vi.2—vii.13; xxv.—xxxii; xxxv.—xl; Levit. i—xvi; xxvii; Num. i.1—x.28 xv; xviii.; xix; xxvi.—xxxii; xxxiii.—xxxvi; Joshua v.10—12; most of xv.—xix.; xxi.1—42;” The work of P was completed in the 5th century B. C.; the several strands were combined and the existing Hexateuch produced. All desiring fuller answer can find it in the Britannica reference given above. We close this section by saying: JED and P were combined with additions between 444 and 300 B. C. into the present Jewish Torah which, as translated, became the Pentateuch. As a final sentence: S. R. Driver recognizes 152 shifts back and forth among J, E, D, P and their copyists in the first 20 chapters of the book Exodus; W. E. Bennett recognizes 205 in the New Century copy of the same.

* * . *

This chapter might interest your clergyman, or some friend.

CHAPTER V

MINDS, MORALS, RELIGION

Ignorance: The World's Greatest Enemy—Promoted by Religion.

The World Battles Against Ignorance.
And that inverted bowl they call the sky,
Whereunder crawling coop'd we live and die,
Lift not your hands to *It* for help—for *It*
As impotently moves as you or I.

The Rubaiyat: 5th Ed. LXXII.

I am here moved by the fact that when differing minds are acted upon by both moral and religious influences some react more strongly to the moral and less strongly to the religious influences, while with others the case is quite reversed. I am also moved by Morality's demonstrated priority to, primacy over and complete independence of, Religion—this by virtue of Morality's place as an element making for human survival. (chap II)

In consequence I am choosing as this chapter's title: *Minds, Morals, Religion*. Here I wish to consider the effects of men's minds and lives and their varying capacities to subject themselves to varying relative proportions of moral and religious influence at one and the same time.

Every writer on the Psychology of Religion whom I have read assumes or admits the fundamental concept or defini-

tion of Religion to be essentially as given on page viii. Then each generally adds thereto supplemental ingredients, moral seasoning etc. to his taste. But none ever includes the definitely religion-made, priestly-guided, even "God-willed" or "God-directed," horribilities of Religion: as, for example documented in the religious barbarities of Num. xxxi:1-18, 31-40; Deut. ii: 30-36; iii: 2-7; vii:1,2,16; xx:10-17; Joshua v.20,21; viii.21-28; x.24-40; xi.8-21; xii.7-24. (Sun and moon stopped x.12-14.) or by the "God wills it (*Deus vult*)" of Pope Urban II when thus he initiated 200 years of bloody Crusades. More of the kind are the centuries of God-serving and God-saving bloody heresy-huntings, inquisitions, witch-burnings and religious wars; the priestly immolation of children by fire etc. as recorded later. These may not be omitted from Religion's moral record in the world. These, too, confirm and substantiate the definition of Religion as this is to be understood in these writings.

Thus I have been forced to break definitely with all of Religion's devotees who hold morality to be Religion's hallmark. The God-idea, and man's imagined access to an imagined reality behind it (and to which he thinks he can make successful appeals for aid)—these constitute the total differential of Religion. All the good, all the morality now generally accredited to Religion is of purely natural, human origin. It arises by evolutionary process out of social instincts as found in many groups of insects, in groups of lower animals, apes and upward through low forms of human life to modern man. For these reasons all who reject this differentiating religious factor, the supernatural, should class themselves, be classed as, and termed non-religious persons. These will hold religion and the God-idea to be illusory and the religionists as persons by so much deceived. Sigmund Freud did precisely that and wrote a book: *The Future of an Illusion*. In it he told the world frankly that it would have to make its choice between culture and religion.

The perennial problem of the worlds of mind, morals

and religion is the endless daily births of countless new minds, all utterly ignorant and credulous. For enlightenment and life orientation all these minds depend upon parents, teachers, companions who, in the world's vast bulk, are themselves mostly and largely ignorant of the important discoveries of fact and truth made by modern science. The thought worlds of astronomy, biology, chemistry, genetics, geology, physics, psychology, sociology, world history, literary and biblical criticism, the world story of evolution—are practically closed to the vast majority who do not go through college. Even those who do go and those who continue and specialize as scientists usually make a dip into but two or three related fields, specialize there and largely ignore the rest.

The philosophers themselves with self-imposed life task to correlate all knowledge find the job stupendous. No one can cover the whole field. But the further one advances the more fully he discovers that the manifold, mysterious, previously unexplained facts of the world have been found, one by one, to lie in the domain of natural law and order, of natural transfers of energy, natural cause and effect; they belong in universal processes of nature, in the normal or abnormal functioning of "mere" human brains and minds.

There does exist a 'uniformity of nature.' This is not a demonstrable principle but an inferred one; but belief in it and action based upon it—the continuously experienced fact of it—has kept the world from 'falling into permanent intellectual confusion' and has given the world its entire body of scientific knowledge. This is the world's justification for continuing to cling to the principle. Matter simply possesses from eternity the properties we discover it has. Out of these flow the world's uniformities of nature and man gains nothing by postulating a God as the establisher of these properties or as a creator of these uniformities. Assuming this principle of Uniformity of Nature man in his activities

produces results uniformly verifiable—results that under the shaping and guidance of human reason can be brought into harmonious accord with the requirements for successful human existence.

Every conclusion of science has been reached in open battle with all opposing ideas. Their totality forms a body of public knowledge always open to check, challenge, repetition or refutation by all the world. Such well established facts are accepted on faith in the world of accredited scientists as truth-seeking men with no ax to grind. Except in the minds of enormous masses of the grossly ignorant and superstitious, the field for the possible activities, or "interferences," of supposed supernatural powers from a supposed supernatural world steadily diminishes toward zero. In the world of science, intellect and culture the "age of miracles" is supposedly past, yet recently two widely publicised "modern miracles" show how thin the veneer of modern scientific education covers our "enlightened civilization." As samples of the calibre and credulity of today's general mentality consider these two.

TWO MID-TWENTIETH CENTURY MIRACLES

August 15, again October 7, 1950, at Necedah, Wisconsin (pop. 836), crowds "estimated officially (Aug. 15) at nearly 100,000" and (Oct. 7) "at 50,000" gathered to see a farm woman, Mrs. Mary Anna Van Hoof, receive "her seventh message from the mother of Jesus." Associated Press (AP) and United Press (UP) reports agree on the size of the crowds, both called both events "the seventh and last appearance." Telephotos were sent out.

For Aug. 15 the AP reported "more than 100 chartered buses and several special trains arriving. About 60 priests and 50 nuns were—before the shrine—" "A loud speaker intoned the decades of the Rosary."

Mrs. Van Hoof retired into the house then "relayed the message she said was given her by the Virgin." This was: "Pray and pray hard. The time is short." "Press observers saw nothing." The UP said: "But the throngs of pilgrims from over the nation, including the lame and halt who came hoping for a Miracle, apparently saw nothing."

On the Oct. 7 occasion the AP quoted a priest who refused to identify himself as saying: "I saw it (the sun) whirl clockwise and it jumped." "News men saw nothing extraordinary." To the priest and some women who reportedly confirmed him the sun, obviously, was not a seething, molten globe 865,000 miles in diameter and 93,000,000 miles away, but just a hot balloon "in the sky" over Necedah. Why shouldn't it "whirl clockwise and jump" to attest the presence there of "the mother of Jesus"?

* * *

On October 15, 1951, the United Press reported the Vatican publication, *Osservatore Romano*, as quoting from an address by Fedrico Cardinal Tedeschini who said "The Pope—Our very Pontiff—saw it—' saw the Virgin at 4 P.M., Oct. 30, Oct. 31 and Nov. 1 of last year (1950). On Nov. 1 the Pontiff established the dogma—that no Catholic can question—of her assumption." (reception up into heaven)

"The Holy Father lifted his eyes in his Vatican gardens toward the sun.—Who is capable of fixing his eyes on the shining sun? But he was able to do so and during those days could witness life of the sun under the hand of Mary. The agitated sun convulsed and transformed into a picture of life, a spectacle of heavenly movements, and transmitted silent but eloquent messages to the Vicar of Christ (the Pope)."

Mary's Assumption is alleged to have occurred at the time of her death and has been remembered on each Aug. 15 since the 6th century. Now that the Pope has had the testimony of his own eyes (?) he proclaims the alleged

event dogmatically as a fact which every Catholic must now believe. This new compulsion does not seem to have caused any great exodus from the Church.

* * * *

Of course my point lies in the ever presence of these ignorant, credulous masses and the fact of highly elaborate ecclesiastical organizations ever standing by to promote and use this ignorance and credulity for their own advantage. If such things as these can happen in the U. S. A. and in Rome in the middle of the 20th century in a world full of encyclopedias, books, periodicals and scientific knowledge, what must have been the conditions in the first century when ignorance and illiteracy were well nigh universal, paper practically unknown, when a flat earth was center of the Universe, Jerusalem or Rome its center and God in the near sky overhead?

Intelligent persons are not surprised or misled today by reports of "miraculous doings" which accumulated about the name of Jesus in the 40 to 80 years following the death of that exceptional man. These were mainly word of mouth reports; and how tales of "miracles" can grow when spread mouth to ear! The Gospel of Mark was not written until about 65-67 A.D.; Matthew about 80-100; Luke about 100; John: Previous dating was about 105 A.D.; recent discoveries near the Dead Sea date it prior to A.D. 70—but not in its present form. (See American Scholar, winter of 1952-53, p. 85) See encyclopedias—not religious ones.

Will any from these miracle seeking hordes go to the encyclopedias or libraries for real information? Scarcely one in a thousand. And with the advent of TV the percentage of the human race able to read intelligently and understandingly seems destined for a terrifying decline. For the future the newly-born seem likely to be educated by propaganda and through their emotions. In such seed-beds, then, we find the psychological bases for the overwhelming prev-

alence of religious atmosphere and religious minds, the explanation of the perpetuation of the world's religious errors, falsifications and mischief-making. Only as minds can be awakened to curiosity, awareness, recognition and understanding of contradictions and an interest in dividing the absurd, the irrational, the false from the coherent, the rational, the true, can they possibly be lifted out of a blind, superstitious faith in religion—in belief in the existence of supernatural powers to which they think they can appeal successfully for help in distress.

Among such minds will often be found but little understanding of or credit or respect for the purposes, powers and achievements of science. To such minds the phone, the radio, autos are just natural things—accepted like trees and cows. I heard a woman, a high school graduate, in a radio quiz, say Thomas Jefferson was the first president whose election was broadcast by TV! Off by 120 years! Such minds will revile Evolution—prove it wrong in large pamphlets backed by a barrage of bible texts; wholly ignorant of the well demonstrated human origins of their supposed “Word of God.” Here is where psychology of religion begins and why acceptance of the supernatural is practically ineradicable from human minds.

* * *

MORALITY, RELIGION AND THEIR NEGATIVES IN COMBINATION

Now let us turn to the various combinations of Morality, Religion and their negatives, recalling first the demonstrated independence, primacy, importance and superiority of Morality over Religion as essential factor in human survival—all set forth briefly and adequately in chapter II.

We may now tabulate minds in groups, tentatively, as follows:

Group A.) Non-moral (?Immoral) Supernaturalistic minds.

Group B.) Non-moral (?Immoral) anti-supernaturalistic minds.

Group C.) Moral supernaturalistic minds.

Group D.) Moral anti-supernaturalistic minds.

This, I conceive, shows these four groups as standing in increasing relative social importance.

Group A.) Immoral, supernaturalistic minds. There have, doubtless, always been such minds. But in primitive days such must have been relatively few; for though practically all believed in the supernatural (i. e. were "religious"), at the same time decent behaviour (morality) was a high essential. Families and tribes had to be prevailingly socially-minded (and, so, moral) to survive, so the non-moral ones lacked favor as always. Pressures of the older and experienced upon the younger must have kept the big majority reasonably well in hand. Be immoral and be long-run loser.

Among primitives the supernatural always had an answer for everything mysterious: The spirits did it; the Power did it: the Devil did it; God did it. In those days there could be no reply to this; nor any even today by countless millions of ignorant minds. These could never know how many, how comprehensive nor what satisfactory answers Nature has for world mysteries when aided by science. Today science, with her genuine revelations of a natural world of natural law and order, disqualifies the supernatural as an allowable hypothesis in any scientific matter. Today nearly any man with enough modern knowledge to be able to recognize Religion's contradictions and falsifications and so, to abandon all supernaturalisms (and be classifiable as anti-supernaturalist) will at the same time have acquired sufficient humanistic, ethical insight to qualify as a much better than average moral risk. Anyone with enough intelligence, courage and honesty today to affirm himself an atheist, in defiance of "respectable" popular thought, would ordinarily find it practically impossible to be a very immoral person. That is a widely established atheistic record. With "reason-

able" exceptions, then, and lapses often quite temporary, such a one (moral-antisupernaturalist) would fit automatically into Group D.

Group B.): As for genuinely immoral, anti-supernaturalists of today: This class probably still remains today the smallest of the four, for the vast majority are still supernaturalistic. For society in general their immorality, not their rejection of the supernatural, is the important factor. They will probably be found to be victims of bad inheritance or bad training, or both, many standing nearer to the mentality of brutehood. For all such the great psychologic need will be more and better education in scientific knowledge, ethical relationships, and social obligation.

Restraint, force, training, education, are all to be used rationally with these—as symptoms indicate and society's need for protection, peace and security dictate.

Groups A.) and C.) Supernaturalistic (C—Moral): From earliest days the vast majority of mankind have had to live under subjection to some sort of propagandised God Hypothesis due to their parentage and practically inescapable ignorance and credulity of their parents. In part, groups A and C may now-a-days well be considered conjointly, as largely they exist and act together in religious sects and church groups, even though an 'awful lot' of these, laity and clergy alike, may easily be classifiable in group A (immoral). Great numbers, though, "believers," in both A and C, are neither members nor attendants of a church. Also, for present day conditions, we shall find it clarifying if in part we consider laity and clergy separately. I begin by listing a few factual instances of individual behaviour and ask the reader to make his own classification for each:

1.) A reliable, credible watch dealer told me of two "sisters" coming to buy a watch for a church lottery. Choice narrowed to a cheap, gaudy watch and a good plain one. One said: "We can make more on the cheap one." The

other: "Yes, but sister Ann wants a watch; she said get a good one."

2.) My Polish shoe-maker talked as he fixed my shoe. He had just returned from visiting a brother, a priest, in Poland. A peasant had called on the priest and paid him to say some prayers. My shoemaker said "I remonstrated." The priest answered: "If he is fool enough to do that, that's no one's business but mine."

3.) I told No. 2 to a friend one day. He replied with this 'true, personal experience': "In a large city X, I knew a young priest in a friendly way. I noticed one day that he appeared 'run down' and asked about it. He said: 'I have so much to do—masses to say for the dead, and I may not eat until I am clear through. My superior says I am young, strong and can 'take it.' He won't give me an assistant.' Some time later I found him looking fine and mentioned his changed appearance. He replied: 'Yes, It's all much better. Those masses—I asked those women: Wouldn't they like to have them said in Poland, where their relatives had died? Yes. Indeed they would; so I arranged it. They still pay me the \$3.00 per mass and I get them said in Poland for three marks (75c) each. This way I make \$2.25 clear on each one and am rid of all the bother.'"

4. Printed from a cut made from a photostat of the Archbishop's letter.

Winnipeg, Man., March 1st, 1944.

My dear Catholic Parents,

I have received from the Pastors of the different Parishes a list of those who have boys overseas. Some time ago, as you are aware, I called on Catholic Mothers to enroll their boys as Perpetual Members of the Society of the Propagation of the Faith. I said: "What better guarantee for any boy exposed to all the hazards of war! A guarantee, should he be killed, that he will go at once to his Maker, to be with

Him for all eternity. A guarantee, should it be God's will, that he will return to his dear Mother and to those who love him." This has been explained to you over and over again, from the pulpit and you have been urged to enroll your boys. A few, who have been personally contacted, have answered the appeal, but all the others have maintained a stolid indifference. If I were to conclude that you are indifferent to the safety of your boy, I would be doing you a grave injustice. *You are not indifferent.* What then can be the reason for the inaction! Some say, in fact many say, that they cannot afford it. That is not a reason, that is a specious excuse, unworthy of a Catholic Mother. You receive a portion of the boy's pay, and what better use can you make of it. "Oh," you answer, "I am trying to have a nest egg for my boy when he returns." *When he returns.* Wouldn't it be better to take the best means you know to ensure the boy's return. If he does not return, what good, under heaven, will the "nest egg" be to him. I am not advising you to take the boy's money, I would much prefer that you use your own money. But, if you must take the boy's money, take it as a loan. Surely you will be able to make it up in the years to come. Do you not think, with a little economy and a few less shows, you will be able to set aside one dollar a month, until the full amount is paid up? It is not necessary to pay the \$40.00 at once. You can pay any sum you wish by instalments. You can pay, say, \$5.00 a month, or \$10.00 every three months. You can take a year, you can take two years, you can even take three years. Three years, that is almost the equivalent of One Dollar per month. The important thing is to ensure the boy's safety, as far as we can do so,—his safety in time and eternity.

One Catholic Mother in this Archdiocese enrolled her boy on Feb. 20th, paying \$20.00. He was killed on Feb. 22nd. Do you not think that the mother's heart found some consolation in what she had done?

I have placed this matter in the hands of the Franciscan

Fathers, at 233 Carlton Street (Tel. 29 136). If you want further explanation, see them or get in touch with them. If time permits, they will probably get in touch with you.

Dear Catholic Parents, we have a chance to do something that will live long in the Annals of the Church in Western Canada, and let us merit God's blessing by doing it.

Yours very devotedly in Xto.,

On the foregoing the reader is expected to exercise his own judgment. This will involve also an assessment by each of the quality of his own judgmental powers. Which group for 1, 2, 3, 4? Who won the watch?

* * *

GROUP A.) THE LAITY (non-moral): The A-Group layman is a shifty, uncertain person, a corner-cutter where his interest is involved. He at least pretends to believe in God and the bible (his kind), in prayer, hell, heaven. Such rest their eternal hopes, mostly: a.) Catholics on Church and priest; b.) other Christians on John iii:16 if they know bible texts—if not, then on ‘God’s mercy.’ Some sixty years ago I had an elderly acquaintance (Presbyterian) whose dealings would not bear very close inspection. He told me: “I hang onto that promise (John iii:16) like a quarter of beef on a meat hook.”

With primary emphasis on “faith,” on “acceptance of Christ” as a personal redeemer and soul-saver, this man is typical of the group. For them religion’s main function is to save men’s souls from hell. Only secondarily comes a morality which makes for truth, honesty, fairness, justice, better human relations. The A-Group layman may support, and many attend, the same church as his C-Group (moral) co-religionist, joining in the same ritual; but A. is one who will temporize behind his eye-brows saying to himself: “It’s all right to be square, but if I can get an inside hook-up with Tom Big-crook on a smooth slickum-job; or work my pull for a fat political contract with the

city council or the legislature; or (in business) spread a lying advertisement by press, TV or radio; or work a crooked income tax trick; or (as employee) do slack work for full pay; or (as repair man) slip in some sabotage that will force an early repeat—Well, That will be nobody's business but mine. You have to look out for Number One." And of course there are many more serious derelictions among the God-believers.

Thus he is an A-Grouper (non-moral). From families of such God-believers come a majority of the names of those in our reform schools and penitentiaries. The "World to Come" has ever been conventional Religion's first concern; that of the Humanistic groups; Ethical Culture etc., has been morality and human uplift and betterment. But the world, in its prevailing ignorance has been entrusting this to supernaturalism, which from first to last has based its faiths upon false statements as to facts, false premises and false theories. *And supernaturalism has not made men realize that "Number One" is one's own self-respect and integrity of character, with top spot to intellectual honesty.* Only his natural-born and experience-built morality can do that for him.

Is man on his life voyage to jettison truth, honesty, justice, self-respect and become a liar, hypocrite, deceiver of the ignorant-and-simple-minded who look to him for leadership; is he to do this because he believes he has for himself an eternal-life-saver in John iii:16, or in a priest's prayers and a church funeral against the voyage's end in death? Would it be a man's morality or his supernaturalism that might make him stop and ask himself: "What kind of a person am I? Do I respect myself?"

If it be his morality, what then is the point and purpose of his supernaturalism? Is it just to keep him out of hellfire and slip him into heaven where he might finally gather enough decency to be able to look back on his earthly career

and see what a pitiful, shameful, lying, hypocritical counterfeit of humanity he or she has been "here below"?

The Humanist won't grant him even that chance for self-appraisal. Like all others the A-Group man must die conscious of how much he has fallen short of living up to the normal standards of decency, honor and self-respect expected of men by men among men. *He will be his own final judge, as every man must be. By how much his self-appraisal falls short of his own concept of what he ought to have been or might have been, by that much he must account his one life as a failure—as a regression toward the primitive brutehood from which evolution had raised his genetic line.* Then he is finished, his one and only life lived on a plane that much nearer to brutehood than he might have lived it if some circumstance of birth, training or environment had introduced into his life a better concept of morality's imperious claim on the individual and of its independence of, its primacy over and its superiority to religion. It is the business of the Ethicist and the Humanist to show men that despite early errors they may yet elevate the planes of their lives and re-establish their own respect of self. If one can die possessing that, he need have no worry about the flames of hell. Nor, for that matter, even if he can't.

THE GROUP B CLERGY: Here we have a real problem on our hands. Among the genuine moral attributes of man none is higher than intellectual honesty. Lacking this, man lacks true moral integrity. No less a person than the late Professor Whitehead has told us: "To acquiesce in discrepancy is destructive of candor and of moral cleanliness."

When we consider the education and training of the men in the most prominent pulpits we find mostly college graduates with later theological seminary courses. Even if they took mostly language, literature, history, sociology, philosophy, they must have had wide general opportunity

to gain much insight into the methods and conclusions of the natural sciences; to learn of the existence and operations of natural law and its complete inclusion of evolution as a thoroughly demonstrated account of the natural history of the world. All natural science rejects the supernatural as an alleged explanation of any physical event—or of the reality of any event if that reality assertedly depends upon supernatural participation.

Evolution and geology completely annihilate the biblical myths of the Creation of Adam, Eve, the snake and apple story, the dogmas of “original sin and the fall of man” and the consequent necessity for a “Redeemer”—These are all foundation stones for all Christian doctrine; also Noah, Ark and Flood. All these never were.

To all true natural scientists the “miracles” of religion are nonsense—generally myths, legends, fables, falsifications handed down by tradition from primitive days of gossip, rumor, illiteracy, superstition and mass-ignorance.

These “desirable-pulpit” clergy, too, have continuing opportunity to consult authoritative articles in libraries, in up-to-date encyclopedias, books and current journals which overflow with such information and demonstrate beyond doubt the purely human origins of all scriptures. These latter were put together over centuries of time in many languages and dialects by many writers with repeated copyings, additions, omissions, interpolations, changes, discrepancies, contradictions, absurdities, trivialities—yet when do we ever hear of a pastor suggesting to his flock that they gather for any intelligent study of the basic scriptural source of their faith and religion—their “Holy Bible, God’s word?” or of the evidences for Evolution and its bearing upon their religious doctrines? *It is not so done.* That would put them all out of a job.

Shall we then say these eminent clergy are ignorant of these well attested facts fundamental to their life-time profession? If so, where does that ignorance leave them as to

qualification for practice today in their lifetime chosen field of human leadership? If not thus ignorant, what becomes of their honesty and sincerity as leaders of thought, as supposed teachers of truth to the ignorant, all so desperately in need of enlightenment? Shall we say these clerics do not dare allow their flocks to suspect the true status of their bible as a highly incredible volume? To do that would cut the bonds of faith which still hold the believing faithful to their religious allegiance. For them these bonds are their main tie-in with social respectability and their one hope for salvation from the fires of hell as that is preached to the least intelligent devotees.

* * *

THE GROUP C CLERGY (MORAL) includes all sincere, devoted, honest-minded clerics. Such will have chosen their calling and prepared for it ordinarily under a sense of duty or opportunity for service to mankind according to their beliefs as to the relations between the human and the divine.

Generally they will be less well educated than the Group B clergy. Skeptics, doubters, may question their sincerity; all may doubt their powers of discernment, think them emotionally driven, victims of early miseducation. But here a most meticulous discrimination must be made. One cannot ordinarily lay a finger on a "member of the cloth" and particularize saying: "You are a hypocrite, a fraud." He, himself, may well be the only one to know truly whether he is an intellectually honest man, sincere in his God-belief and his mission, or a tongue-in-cheek hypocrite with self-purpose of his own to serve. In the long run, however, honesty generally makes itself apparent to the perspicacious. But a multiplicity of *facts as they stand* render suspect the clergy as a whole and continue to diminish the fading respect for the supernatural in the minds of the educated and cultural world.

The C Group, clergy and laity, (moral) through the cen-

turies and now, has its sustaining basis in the continuing daily birth of individuals having naturally a preponderantly moral attitude toward the world. By virtue of this native bent, home training, social experiences, they have matured with a dislike for brutalities, cruelties, injustices, lies, as these have variously affected them. They possess a friendly, non-aggressive disposition and (with Group D) constitute the great majority of agreeable persons found in the world. None needs be thought perfect in his moral totality but the average for each for the whole range of feeling and social behaviour is in the high brackets. This is a basic, native morality which evolved out of strong social instincts—the family and tribal survival-element of chapter II. Religionists would hold this to be the effect of the religious element in their make-up; but this does not follow. The morality of moral individuals is mainly inborn. Behaviour-instruction, indeed, often improves morals, softens egoism, tones down many self-centered individuals into harmonious social co-operation. But this is ethical rather than religious training. The religiousness which all such may have acquired was gained by childhood education, by propaganda inculcated; supernaturalistic. There is no other way to get it as it is never inborn.

THE C GROUP LAITY (MORAL, SUPERNATURALISTIC): These range from the grossly ignorant, highly credulous devotees through the technically "more literate" in a limited sense, to a minor fraction of high-school-and-college-graduated business and professional men who, with their families, are more or less regular church-goers and supporters. All this forms a vast reservoir from which pour annual floods of like-minded, slightly inquisitive human beings whose faith gives religion its substantial foundation and basic financial support; yet not forgetting B-Laity (immoral) and its vast contributions here.

The less, and least, enlightened minds in this C-Group laity look to the priest, "God's representative," as the man

with all the answers. His word is for them essentially "the law;" He can keep or get you and your near kin out of purgatory or hell if you keep on his good side with suitable fees or contributions. In Catholic circles faith in such powers extends even to well educated lay adherents.

Such "true believers" hold their sacred scriptures (Bible, Koran, Vedas, Book of Mormon, etc., according to locality) as divine revelation, "God's Word," highly venerated, little read. Of course there is a God; of course the clergy are necessary for baptisms, weddings, funerals, at least, and for certain public occasions: opening political conventions and certain legislative sessions where an invocation or benediction is in good form—some one used to talking to God. And "of course morality and the world would go to pot without the church and religion."

These people generally know nothing (and the brightest but little) about the natural sciences and evolution. With minds early conditioned to the supernatural they are rarely able to recognize religion's exposed contradictions. To the vast majority these are never presented in any comprehensive or convincing way. Besides, it takes a fairish mind to grasp the sense and force of a contradiction. Literally millions of Christian Science followers, Mormons, Catholics, Protestant Fundamentalists, not to mention Eastern religions have no such power today. For all such the Spirit-idea, the God-idea, and the ecclesiastical machinery attached thereto stand as explanation of everything abnormal, unusual or yet unexplained, for science is still young, and even yet relatively few rightly comprehend the spirit of, and necessity for, its free rein to all investigation and search for truth. Thus, furnishing all the answers, the supernatural is the common Man's natural metaphysics for all his wondering about the universe.

While the truth as to facts and their relations has always been the quest and goal of science, ethics and philosophy, this has rarely been so of the religious-minded in so far as

it pertains to their own domain. To them "religious truths" came as revelations direct from God to his ancient seers and prophets in one of the more than fifty mutually contradictory "revealed scriptures" or bibles or by personal delivery from God to the so-called mystics whose direct emotional experiences are interpreted and claimed by them as divine revealments. To search out, check over and verify facts and relations as science requires its devotees to do, is beyond the capacity of the average religious mind that clings to its religiosity. This mind works differently.

A seeming exception to this appears in a small and diminishing subgroup of Group C. A few scientific minds of high natural morality appear to have been so conditioned by youthful indoctrinations to the claims of religion as being the fountain-head of goodness and morality and the seat of conscience that their acceptance of these claims has become a reflex operating subconsciously—as automatic as digestion. What mother told them of God and the bible remains through life as "the Gospel Truth." They seem either to lack capacity to free themselves from this hold or have not well investigated the matter. Never in this world has there been any other source for morality than from natural human beings whose social instincts have developed into naturally moral behaviour, and there never will be. Such exceptional religious-minded scientists (with some faltering, uncertain or fearsome college presidents, still confused as to the mutual independence of morality and supernaturalism) do a vast disservice to both science and human morals when they support as necessary the linkage of morality and its survival values with the widely demonstrated falsifications that characterize religion's foundations. Any school text that averaged one-tenth of one percent of as many falsehoods as does Christianity's bible would be incontinently thrown out of our schools, as well it should be.

Reverting for a few final words on the clergy, A and C:

If the skeptic deprecates the clergyman's calling, he will be wiser, unless and until his evidence is overwhelming, to think of and be sorry for him as a man befooled by his failure rightly to apprehend the realities of the world rather than to revile him as hypocrite, opportunist or racketeer. Here it would be easy to do a good man a grave injustice. Each individual should have the benefit of a fair appraisal even when he clearly casts away his right to any benefit. I do not here set forth any criterion for judgment. Each must form his own on the evidence available. However, I can well imagine the wonder of some of the sincere, devout ones as to how *I* can fail to see the God evidences so obvious to them—just as I wonder at *their* apparent inability to see (or seeming lack of interest or curiosity or honesty to try to find out) the multiplicity of obvious natural relationships which for me nullify all need for supernatural explanations.

Though many clergy are obviously insincere and not a few lay themselves open as being clearly "on the make," with a badly disguised segment operating plain religious rackets, I consider the most shameful and socially harmful immorality of the A Group clergy to be the continued silent evasion, on the part of its intellectual, educated section, of science's ever present challenge to the reality of Religion's basic claims. Their immoralities are not criminalities but matters in conflict with the consciences of honest, intelligent men.

Truly enough, cases of many an emotional evangelist, of JESUS SAVES banner flaunters, of YOUTH FOR CHRIST trumpeters and COME TO JESUS panhandlers and mail and radio money-solicitors give substantial grounds for belief that the enthusiasms thus displayed are but evidence of many organized rackets that are being put over on the ignorant, emotional young and a gullible public. The late Professor Knight Dunlap tells of the failure of efforts to effect social control by religion through Billy Sunday re-

vivals. "In one city, the actual 'rake off' was really nearly twice as much as the sum announced in the press.—The bulk of the donations came from men of wealth, who were, for the most part, little interested in religion, except as a means of 'social control,' and whose lives were far from being in accordance with the conventions of Christian morality.

"The donors—had been persuaded that a recrudescence of 'old time religion' would stabilize society and soothe the discontent of the under-privileged classes. The idea that had been sold to them was that labor would be motivated to keep its place in subordination to capital insofar as old time religion was instilled into the laborers. The press had an important share in the promotion of the campaigns, beginning a ballyhoo in each city weeks before the performances commenced. Without that publicity the campaigns could not have been conducted with financial success. —

"The revival business collapsed when the large contributions ceased and the ballyhoo—let up. This collapse, it appears, was due to the discovery by potential donors that the results of the revivals were negligible and practically nonexistent. The number of 'trail hitters' (converts) publicly announced was impressive, but the numbers were fraudulent.—there the racket broke down,—" (*Relig.: Its Functions etc.* 304-5)

However it is probable that much similar evangelistic religious emotionalism is deliberately promoted for purposes of social control—whipped up to center mass attention on the 'world to come' and so divert it from matters political and economic.

Group B, whether clergy or laity, are a dangerous lot.

To close this section we note that in *Human Biology* of September, 1931, a quarterly journal published by the Johns Hopkins University Press for the University, is an article: *Church Membership and Commitments to Prison*. It is from

the University's department of biology of the School of Hygiene and Public Health and by Prof. John H. Miner.

This article is a study in highly complicated statistics covering nine years of criminal records for the Netherlands and, for the United States, a record of "25,726 persons imprisoned in twenty-seven penitentiaries (and) 7,108 in nineteen reform schools, industrial schools and the like."

It is out of the question to try to report details on these statistics in a chapter already highly condensed and overloaded as is this. The most that can be done here is to give this reference and say that this article and report closes on page 436 with this sentence:

"There is little evidence in these data that the churches play any large part in the prevention of crime." (Our emphasis)

This covers the church elements in both my B and C groups combined.

GROUP D. (Moral, Anti-supernatural): If fairness of purpose, honest intent, sincerity of intelligent belief, impartiality of judgment and evenhanded justice do not prevail more or less 'naturally' as ideas in men's minds, the men lack just that much moral quality, whatever religious beliefs they may profess. However, these very qualities do obtain widely, together with an utter lack of the beliefs here termed supernaturalistic—especially among men of scientific, psychologic, ethical and general philosophic interest where they are not bound by early fixations upon supernaturalism. Such are the 'Anti-supernaturalistic Moralites.'

In mankind's earlier days, with practically all in the grip of supernaturalism (religion), the non-religious were few or none. With gods everywhere, with science almost non-existent and naturalism so little understood, morality and irreligion (anti-supernaturalism) could merge but slowly in individual minds, and then only as the most morally disposed mind's gained enough intelligence to discover an

reject Religion's misinterpretations, contradictions, falsehoods and so became non-religious—commonly termed "irreligious" by the religious.

But today, under the genuine revelations of the world's recently-born and rapidly growing Science, the group of Anti-supernaturalistic-Moral-ites expanded rapidly, drawing its recruits largely from the C-Group as these discover Religion's basic contradictions and falsehoods and the complete mutual independence of morality and supernaturalism. Evidence of the rapidly growing importance of these Anti-supernaturalistic-Moral-ites is to be seen in the rapidly growing percentages of the world's leading scientists and intellectuals who have abandoned belief in God, in the bible as the revealed 'Word of God' and in immortality. Also the roster of disbelieving philosophers and metaphysicians continues to mount. Here "retreat by definition" becomes a growing loophole of evasion for weakening religionists.

Here the less forthright dissenters from earlier orthodoxies recast their definitions of God so vaguely that these mean nothing to bible-carrying Christians. With the growing realization that personal morality is wholly independent of supernaturalism this D-Group may well be expected to expand with a compounding acceleration leading to a hopeful gain in knowledge, culture and morality as Science and the Humanistic groups increasingly take over. *Theirs* is now the task to lead the world into enlightened ways by use of approved scientific methods and clean up the general moral world-mess that has followed upon thousands of years of Religion's misdirection and general mishandling of the world's moral interests, due first to man's inescapable native ignorance and credulity and second to Religion's (supernaturalism's) own incurable, perennial incapacity and/or unwillingness to recognize the false and reject it.

Let future national and international conventions of scientists and Humanistic groups—a Humanist, Ethical,

Free-Thought, Union (?)—set themselves to analyse this situation and implement the tasks which will confront them. They will face the eternal problem of billions of babes being born ignorant, credulous, many of them still brutes. Their hope will lie in the fact that all decency and goodness in the world arose out of men's native social instincts—out of his naturalistic, survival-engendered, humanistic morality; that the world's highest, noblest, moral standards are simply those of the world's finest, noblest men. *All there is in Religion at its claimed best is nothing other than what natural man has produced at his human best. Let's stop robbing man in order to give this credit to God.*

Since the dawn of mind Religion has added nothing to this natural morality but falsehoods—save where it borrowed or, by false pretensions of God-direction as in the case of Moses, seized the habiliments of morality as a disguise. Meanwhile she continues to flout the essence of morality by a consistent lack of will or ability, or both, to discriminate between the true and the false; by adhering to and teaching wildly incredible tales, myths, legends, old wives fables as true; by making and upholding reports of gross violations of nature's laws because these were allegedly 'revealed' in an alleged 'Word of God' abounding in well demonstrated errors, contradictions and falsehoods; by closing the eyes to or vigorously suppressing all conflicting evidence which nullifies her claims; by gross outrages against those of opposing beliefs.

The open attitude of our Group D toward the world of knowledge is the complete opposite of the supernaturalistic attitude. It is openly investigative; its methods and aims are those of modern science of which the steady purpose is to find facts, truth and knowledge and teach these to all mankind.

Some idea of the progress the world is achieving in thought and morals by the devotion of this D-Group to this

scientific attitude is well shown by the increasing abandonment by the intellectual and cultural world of all that savors of the supernatural:

THE LEUBA QUESTIONNAIRE

In 1933 a questionnaire, sent out to American scientists by the late Prof. James H. Leuba of the Ethics Department of Bryn Mawr College, asked them as to their beliefs in:

1.) "a God to whom one may pray in the expectation of receiving an answer; by 'answer' I mean more than the subjective effect of prayer."

2.) "in personal immortality—the belief in continuation of the person after death in another world."

The answers, by percentages, were as follows:

BELIEVERS	Physicists	Biologists	Sociologists	Psychologists
in God	lesser	43	31	30
	greater	17	12	13
in Immor- tality	lesser	46	32	31
	greater	20	13	10
				2

See his *The Reformation of the Churches*, chs. iii, iv. (Beacon Press, 1950)

Under 'Physicists' Prof. Leuba "included all the scientists concerned with organic matter, such as physicists proper, chemists geologists, astronomers. The 'Biologists' include all those dealing with organic matter: the biologists proper, physiologists, botanists." (p. 32)

* * *

BELIEF: The question of the morality or immorality of such beliefs and disbeliefs may not be passed here in silence since Jesus, himself, is alleged to have made some drastic reflections on this matter, especially with reference to himself as the saviour of mankind: "He that believeth in me

and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi: 16); also see John iii: 18 and 36.

This all lies in the theological field—the field of 'relations with God.' It enters into the domain of morals or ethics only insofar as the fundamental bases of one's beliefs and disbeliefs are concerned. On this point I know of no one who has expressed himself so clearly or so beautifully as the late Belgian playwright, Maurice Maeterlinck; and I can find no more perfect way to close this chapter of our study than to quote:

MAETERLINCK ON THE BELIEF IN GOD

"The happiness we experience in the things we believe, that is to say the certitude of our life, the peace and confidence of our inner being, our questioning yet devoted assent, active and not resigned, to the laws of nature—does not all this depend more on the way in which one believes than on the substance of one's belief?

"I am able to believe, in a manner so religious and (so) unlimited, that there is no God, that my brief appearance here has no end outside itself, that the existence of my soul is no more necessary in the economy of this boundless world than the fleeting shades of color on a flower. You may believe minutely that a single, all-powerful God loves and protects you; I shall be happier and more calm than you if my doubt is more lofty, more serious and more noble than your faith; if it has more intimately questioned my soul; if it has made the rounds of a wider horizon; if it has loved more things.

"The God in which I do not believe will become more powerful and give me more comfort than the one in which you do believe (gives you) if I have achieved to having my doubt rest on thoughts and sentiments vaster and purer than those which support your faith.

"Finally: To believe or not to believe, that is a matter of trifling importance. What is important is the honesty, the comprehensiveness, the disinterestedness and the profundity of the reasons for which one believes or for which one disbelieves." (*Wisdom and Destiny*, LXXIX.)

Translated from the French original by the present writer. See appendix.

AN INTERESTING LONG-RANGE PREDICTION

At this break in our work we insert a verbatim quotation of a book Review in *The Reporter* of Nov. 11, 1952, p. 40, by Gouverneur Paulding, a staff writer—as follows:

"In *Rumor and Reflection* (Simon and Schuster, 1952, \$6.00) the diary of Bernard Berenson, a Florentine art connoisseur, for 1940-41 we are told:

'If man survives another five thousand years—we now living and acting will seem to people of that distant date to have belonged to what we call 'antiquity.' Should anyone question this, he will be advised to look at—how much that combination of Jewish religion, Greek metaphysics, and Roman imperialism known as Christianity dominates us still.—' Ours is only the 'present phase of the antique world.' In the unpredictable future 'the least changed will remain man himself' with his aspirations toward the good, the true, the beautiful. Man's task is to fight all that impedes these aspirations."

The point in inserting the above in this work is: 1. that it is an item or idea worth reading on its own account; 2. that writers of today and of the coming years should help carry onward into that far distant future the idea that as far back as early 19th century books were being written showing that even then there were people who realized how largely and grievously the world was being dominated by supernaturalism and, in that respect at least, belonged then in "antiquity."

PART II

THE RECORD OF RELIGION
WHEN IN POWER

CHAPTER VI

ISRAEL GROWS IN POWER

“—all morality may be summed up in the disinterested service of the human race,—such being—the fundamental principle of the ethical philosophy which is based on the doctrine of Evolution.”

John Fiske, *Cosmic Philosophy*, II:418

In chapter 3 we were concerned with the theoretical problem of the origin of the moral instinct in man; of the sanctions on which ethical acts are based. Now we shall consider examples of practice of human behaviour under religious sanctions—all for the glory of God, or for the benefits and favors he allegedly grants to his devotees for their obedience.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL IN POWER: We are told (*Genesis xv: 18-21*) “—the Lord made a covenant with Abram (later, ‘Abraham:’ *Gen. xvii:5*)—unto thy seed have I given this land, (that of) the Kenites, Kenizites,—Kadmonites,—Hittites,—Perizzites,—Rephaims, —Amorites,—Canaanites,—Girgashites,—Jebusites.” This is twice confirmed (*Exodus iii:8, 15-17*), adding the Hivites but omitting Nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, above. It describes the land as “good—large—flowing with milk and honey.”

In *Numbers (i:1-3)* “The Lord spake unto Moses—the second year after they were come out of—Egypt—take (the sum by name and tribe of) every male—from twenty years

old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel" The total was 603,550 (i:46) omitting the Levites who were charged with priestly duties.

As the Exodus escapees approached their destination "Moses (from far south—and under the Lord's command) sent (a chosen band) to spy out the land of Canaan—whether it be good or bad—fat or lean" and "the people—whether they be strong or weak, few or many." The spies returned with "grapes, pomegranates and figs" and said of the land: "—surely it floweth with milk and honey; and this is the fruit of it." (Num xiii:1-33)

But part of the report told of walled cities, giants and dangers. The Lord, Moses, Aaron, Caleb and Joshua were all for going on in, but there was strong opposition and rebellion by Korah and many others. The Lord became very angry, threatened a plague and finally, upon Moses' prediction, "The earth opened her mouth and swallowed (the opposing leaders) up, and their houses." "And there came out a fire from the Lord, and consumed the two hundred fifty men (their followers)." (Num. xiv; xvi: 1-35)

When for this the people murmured anew against Moses and Aaron, the Lord sent a plague upon the people and "they that died in the plague were fourteen thousand and seven hundred, besides them that died about the matter of Korah." (Num. xvi:41-50)

One south Canaanite king, Arad, did capture some of the spies and fought Israel. Then Israel vowed—unto the Lord—"If thou wilt deliver this people into my hand,—I will utterly destroy their cities." And the Lord hearkened—and delivered up the Canaanites; and they utterly destroyed them and their cities." (Num. xxi:1-3)

As the Israelites worked northward they were refused border-passage by Sihon, king of the Amorites (Num. xxi: 21-25) Then, as Moses tells the story (Deut. ii:24-36): "And the Lord our God delivered him (Sihon) before us; and we

smote him, and his sons, and all his people. And we took all his cities—and utterly destroyed the men, and the women, and the little ones, of every city, we left none to remain. Only the cattle we took for a prey unto ourselves, and the spoil of the cities which we took.—there was not one city too strong for us; the Lord our God delivered all unto us.”

Continuing his story, Moses reports turning “up the way of Bashan (whose king, Og) came out against us,—And the Lord said—Fear him not; for I will deliver him—into thy hand; and thou shalt do unto him as thou didst unto Sihon —So the Lord our God (did)—And we took all his cities—three score cities—beside unwalled towns a great many. And we utterly destroyed them as we did unto Sihon—utterly destroying the men, women, and children of every city. But all the cattle, and the spoil of the cities, we took for a prey to ourselves.” (Deut. iii:1-7)

In the course of Israel’s advance some were seduced by Moab’s gods and daughters and by Midian’s women (Num. xxv:1-18) “And the Lord (said) unto Moses: Vex the Midianites and smite them.” Hence (Num. xxxi:1-54) Moses assembled his thousands “And they warred against the Midianites, as the Lord commanded Moses; and they slew all the males. And they slew the kings of Midian (five by name).—And the children of Israel took all the women of Midian captives, and their little ones, and took the spoil of all their cattle, and all their flocks and all their goods. And they burnt all their cities—and all their goodly castles, with fire.—And they brought the captives, and the prey, and the spoil unto Moses and Eleazar the priest—And Moses was wroth with the officers of the host, with the captains over thousands—which came from the battle. And Moses said unto them, Have ye saved all the women alive? Behold, these caused the children of Israel—to commit trespass against the Lord—Now therefore kill every male among

the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women-children (virgins) keep alive for yourselves." (verses 1-18)

Next the Lord gives rules for dividing the prey or booty among the soldiers the priests and the "congregation." The total was: 675,000 sheep, 72,000 beeves, 61,000 asses; 32,000 (virgins); gold (jewels, chains, bracelets, rings, ear-rings) 16,750 shekels, gold. (NOTE: This would be about \$166,550.)

This whole story is from the Priestly code or document, with gold and exchange valued as of about 1900 A. D.)

All experts pronounce it non-historical and incredible for at least the reason that here Midian is reported as totally destroyed (verses 7,17,18,35); yet some two hundred years later Midian is one of Israel's most powerful enemies. (Judges vi, vii, viii) (But it is reputed to be "The Word of God")

If religious devotees would evade the high immoralities of this story by classing it with the Exodus fictions as "a piece of imaginative, priestly idealism," they must accept the fact that the priestly writer has deceived a credulous world for some twenty-four hundred years by deliberate falsification of history in the name of God and religion. This in itself is an immorality of high degree.

Deuteronomy was produced by four or more writers in the 7th and 6th centuries B. C. Much of it purports to record Moses' recital of his activities of some seven hundred years earlier. His death is recorded at the close of its last chapter.

It was in this book and Exodus that the Priesthood took over the custody of morals for the western world. My thesis has been, and continues to be, the priority of and necessity for morality as an emergent out of the natural social instincts of the lower orders of life and that it constitutes a survival element essential to human evolution. Religion, originating much later and in a wholly different way and out of the rise of the God-idea, has no such sanc-

tions. Therefore when moral sentiments, acts, feelings, injunctions, rules of conduct, appear in connection with religious practices, I find it quite impossible to connect the two and have morality appear as any sort of effect with religion as its cause. All morality is purely human in its origins. It arises naturally, even the Golden Rule itself, in the minds of men of natural good will.

Quite contrariwise, upon examination we shall discover that the evils brought to our attention in this chapter and the next arise out of immoralities caused by the false indoctrinations of religion. The next two, and last, of these examples will illustrate perfectly what I have just said. Religion is vastly more concerned about man's relations to its God than about man's relations to his fellow men. Seek out Religion's moralities in what now follows.

In Deut. xi:7-25 we find: "But your eyes have seen all the great acts of the Lord which he did. Therefore shall ye keep all the commandments which I command you this day, that ye may—go in and possess the land—a land that floweth with milk and honey—(23-25) Then will the Lord drive out all these nations from before you, and ye shall possess greater nations and mightier than yourselves. Every place whereon the soles of your feet shall tread shall be yours;—There shall no man be able to stand before you; for the Lord your God shall lay the fear of you and the dread of you upon all the land that ye shall tread upon, as he hath said unto you."

Deut. xiii:1-15 tells us: "If—a prophet or a dreamer of dreams (says) Let us go after other gods—Thou shalt not hearken unto (him)—(He) shall be put to death; because he hath spoken to turn you from the Lord your God—So shalt thou put the evil away from the midst of you."

Verses 6-16 continue: "If thy brother,—son, (daughter, wife or thy bosom friend, says) Let us go and serve other gods—Thou shalt not consent unto him—neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, (nor) conceal him:

But thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones, that he die;—And all Israel shall hear, and fear—” “If—in one of thy cities (it be found that certain men) have withdrawn (its) inhabitants, saying, Let us go and serve other gods,—Thou shalt surely smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, and all that is therein, and the cattle thereof,—And thou shalt—burn with fire the city, and all the spoil thereof every whit,—and it shall be a heap forever.”

To close this section, Deut. xx: 10-18 now gives us general rules for promoting the Will and Kingdom of God and the fortunes of Israel by the sword:

“When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it.—if it make—an answer of peace, and open to thee, then—all the people—therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and they shall serve thee.—but (if it) will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it: And when the Lord thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword: But the women and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself;—But of the cities of these people, which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth: But thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely the Hittites (Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites, Jebusites); as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee.”

After Moses died Joshua took over and put these directions into practice. At the river Jordan (Joshua iii:15-19) when the priests with the ark of the Lord stepped into the water “the waters—stood and rose upon a heap—(those below) failed—and the priests that bare the ark—stood firm on dry ground in the midst of Jordan, and all the Israelites passed over on dry ground—” When the priests with the ark

came up “unto the dry land—the waters—flowed over all (its) banks as they did before.” (iv:15) Those who want more blood can have an orgy of it in chapters 6 to 12 of the book of Joshua. Chapter 12 names thirty-one kings whom “Joshua and the children of Israel smote” all in the name of and under direction of “the Lord.”

How would you like to rear *your* family in a land of no Religion?

CHAPTER VII

THE RECORD OF RELIGION WHEN IN POWER

THE GROWTH OF CHRISTIANITY IN POWER:

From those ancient Israelitish days of immediate, personally conducted Divine guidance we pass to the records of European Christianity; actions on a continental scale over a period of some fifteen hundred years toward any and all who rejected its claims, denied its authority, opposed its will or differed from its interpretation of what it held to be the "revealed will and word of God." Here we can make only the barest sketches. Our showing will have its proper effect only if the reader can be persuaded thereby to examine for himself some fair part of the mountains of terrible but authoritative evidence that awaits his attention in this field. Our presentation should be ten or twenty times as long as the following inadequate one.

THE GROWTH OF THE CHURCH IN POWER: In the first three centuries A. D. the Christians were a persecuted minority, often begging earnestly, as through the Church fathers, Tertullian and Lactantius, for freedom of worship and toleration at the hands of the Roman Empire and the devotees of paganism. Yet as early as the second century they had expanded and divided into many sects with conflicting beliefs, all intolerant of each other. (FOOTNOTE: Gal. i:8,9; I Tim. i:17-20) Of these the Catholics (later to become the Roman Catholics) grew and con-

solidated most rapidly, became the orthodox or Athanasian group—as opposed to the Arians (with an “i”)—by the Council of Nice (325 A. D.) and, finally becoming the official or state religion under Constantine (323-337), fought with these and many other differing groups all of whom they named “heretics.”

ROMAN CATHOLICISM GROWS IN POWER: The early conflicts were controversial: letters, treatises, books, then by exclusion of fellowship; by excommunication of non-conformists of their own group. The earliest persecutors of pagans and heretics were the Christian emperors from Constantine to Theodosius the Younger (435 A.D.). The Theodosian Code contains no fewer than seventy-two laws against controversialists and heretics with penalties of confiscation, banishment and death “for breach of what Romanists are pleased to call ‘Catholic Unity.’” (W. N. Rule: *Hist. of Inq.* p. 1) Later, as the Church grew in strength, it began to coerce the secular power of states and rulers into inflicting the penalty of death upon such dissident or heretical individuals and groups as the ecclesiastical authorities might condemn.

The idea of a church having power to coerce kings and emperors seems at first fantastic; but, holding the keys of heaven and hell, determining men’s immortal destinies by the nod of priest, bishop or pope, with priests present at death-beds advising in the making of wills, with excommunication and the pronouncement of anathema becoming terrifying possibilities, the Church grew so rapidly in wealth and power that kings, queens, emperors were repeatedly in terror. Thorndyke (*Hist. of Mediaeval Europe*: 105, 283) tells us “—by the fifth century the (Catholic) Church is estimated to have become the greatest landholder in the (Roman) Empire.” Again: “The Church was the greatest land holder in existence; in the Carolingian period (768-987) one third of all Gaul (practically coextensive with modern France) belonged to the Church.” In 710 A. D.

Justinian II, Emperor of Rome, kissed the foot of Pope Constantine I.; Emperor Sigismund with Pope Martin later did the same.

Hallam (*Europe During the Middle Ages*: 444) tells us: "It was a winter of unusual severity. (1087 A. D.) The Emperor (Henry IV of Germany and Italy) was admitted, without his guards, into the outer court of the castle and three successive days remained from morning till evening in a woolen shirt and with naked feet; while (Pope) Gregory (VII)—refused to admit him to his presence. On the fourth day he obtained absolution; but only on condition that—"

Power like that speaks for itself. It is augmented by the credulity and abnegation of those called upon to obey. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries at the height of its power the Church became in effect a universal, totalitarian monarchy with laws and courts of its own; with the pope as lawgiver, judge, tax-assessor and collector through his agents the papal legates.

Robinson (*Mediaeval and Modern Times*, 200) tells us: "—in 1376 a report (to the English Parliament) was made to the effect that the taxes levied by the Pope in England were five times those raised by the king." At this time the Church (with its bishops) owned "more than a third of the (English) soil." (Green: *A Short Hist. of the Eng. People*. p. 250)

CATHOLIC PERSECUTION OF "HERETICS:" The great Church Father, St. Augustine (354-430), strongly upheld the coercion of heretics—if for no other reason than for their own (the heretics) salvation. The first death penalty for heresy was in 385 A. D. The case, begun in Bordeaux, prosecuted by two bishops, was transferred to Treves (Prussia). A Spanish bishop, Priscillian, a Manichaean (see below) and six followers, one a woman, were tried by use of torture and put to death. By its very firstness this caused

great indignation and protest in the Church. Gibbon discusses it at length, closing with:

"Since the death of Priscillian, the rude attempts at persecution have been refined and methodized in the holy office, which assigns their distinct parts to the ecclesiastical and secular powers. The devoted victim is regularly delivered by the priest to the magistrate and by (him) to the executioner; and the inexorable sentence of the church, which declares the spiritual guilt of the offender, is expressed in the mild language of pity and intercession." (Gibbon: Decline and Fall of The Roman Empire: Milman ed., ii:557-60)

In 447 Pope Leo I "declared that if the followers of heresy so damnable (as Priscillian's) were allowed to live there would be an end of human and divine law." Thus early, then, the Church became "definitely pledged to the destruction of heresy at whatever cost." (Lea), Hist. of Inq. i:215)

The great Catholic authority, St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), well after the Inquisition had settled down to its deadly work, said: "Heretics are not to be tolerated. The tenderness of the Church allows them to have two warnings, after which, if pertinacious, they are to be abandoned to the secular power and removed from the world by death." (Quoted by Lea. H. of I. i:229, 230)

In all these heresy cases except as noted otherwise, it is the Church of Rome, through its established agents and agencies, that was the prosecutor and persecutor.

WHAT WAS HERESY?

You were a heretic if (a) you were an Arian; *i.e.* if (Homoiousianism) you believed that Christ was made of substance only *similar* to the substance God was made of, and not made of the *same* substance (Homoousianism).

(b) if you were a Manichaean, *i.e.* if you believed God made all good things but the Devil made all evils; that the two are in eternal conflict and that man should aid God by mortifying the flesh.

(c) If you *disbelieve* that people have souls; or (d) that the soul is of the same shape as the body; or (e) that there is a Purgatory and a need for masses to be said for the souls of the dead; or (f) that the saints can hear men's prayers and give them help; or (g) that the eucharist (the bread and wine of the communion service) is (are) the very body and blood, ("the Real Presence") of Christ—the Transubstantiation heresy; or (h) in the Immaculate Conception of Mary the mother of Jesus, *i.e.* that she was not born (or *do believe* that she *was* born) of a natural father, and so "subject to Original Sin" due to the "Fall of Adam;" Of course you were a heretic if you criticized the unspeakable corruption that for centuries marked Church officials of both high and low degree and that led to the Lutheran revolt in 1517 and finally to the Protestant Reformation. All Protestant sects then became heretics. The most dangerous and damnable heretics, perhaps were the "witches and sorcerers." See below.

If you were a Moslem, you were an "infidel," to be coerced, persecuted, banished, murdered, your property confiscated—as occurred to all heretics. If you were a Jew, you were just a Jew and the sky was the limit to what anyone might choose to do to you.

All these and other heresies, more than thirty-five different sects or varieties by name, received differing emphasis at different times and in different places but all of them had their martyrs by torture, imprisonment, starvation and death—including burning alive by the thousands. Any uninformed reader, made angry by the historical record, who here stops his reading, can only remain deceived, yet makes no change in the record. The truths that follow are the truths that can make men free.

THE STORY OF RAYMOND VI, OF TOULOUSE, AND THE CATHARI.

From as early as 1017 the Church had been burning the Cathari, a Manichaean sect; once one hundred eighty at one time. These had lived centuries in south France and grown strong. In 1163 Pope Alexander III called the Council of Tours (five hundred fifty-five Cardinals, Bishops and Abbots present), described this "damnable heresy" and commanded the bishops and all the Lord's priests to hunt them out and restrain them "with canonical severity." (W. H. Rule; *Hist. of the Inquis.*, pp. 2, 3, 4) But the Cathari were so strong and prosperous that this and later Councils got but slight results—some minor crusades and sporadic burnings.

In 1195, at age thirty-eight, Raymond VI of Toulouse, the first lay peer of France, with fourteen other counts as vassals, inherited his father's vast domains in Languedoc, now southern France. Indifferent to religion, he tolerated the heresy of his subjects. His domain was happy and prosperous and all relationships, internal and external, peaceful. H. C. Lea, in a fully documented History of the Inquisition, in nineteen hundred six pages, tells us:

"When, in 1195, the Council of Montpellier anathematized all princes who neglected to enforce the Lateran canons (Roman Catholic laws) against heretics and mercenaries, he (Raymond) paid no attention to its utterances. It would, in fact, have required the utmost fanaticism to lead a prince so circumstanced to provoke his vassals, to lay waste his territories, to massacre his subjects, and to invite assaults from watchful rivals, for the purpose of enforcing uniformity in religion and subjugation to a Church known only by its rapacity and corruption." (*Lea. Hist. of Inq.* I: p. 133)

In 1188 a new pope, Innocent III, began to organize the full power of the Church against Raymond. He addressed the king of France; all the faithful throughout France were

called to crusade against Raymond. *The lands of the heretics were to be the prize of the spoilers.* In 1208 Innocent began actions that later developed into the terrible Inquisition. His papal bull "threatened any prince who refused to extirpate heretics from his realm, with excommunication, and with the forfeiture of his dominions." In 1209 the Council of Avignon "enjoined all bishops to call upon the civil power to exterminate heretics." (Lecky. *Hist. of Rationalism in Europe*, ii:38)

The story is long and complicated. History calls it "The Albigensian Crusades." Lea gives it and the Cathari a hundred twenty pages. Under the urgings of three successive popes, Innocent III, Honorius III and Gregory IX, southern France was kept in a frenzy of religious persecutions, wars and massacres until 1229. Hallam says of this crusade:

"It was prosecuted with every atrocious barbarity which superstition, the mother of crimes, could inspire. Languedoc, a country, for that age, flourishing and civilized, was laid waste by these desolators; her cities burned, her inhabitants swept away by fire and sword. And this was to punish a fanaticism ten thousand times more innocent than their own, and errors which, according to the worst imputations, left the laws of humanity and the peace of social life unimpaired." (FTNOTE: *History of the Middle Ages*, p. 22)

At Beziérs alone (July, 1209) twenty thousand were massacred; some report far higher figures. "From infancy in arms to tottering age, not one was spared—seven thousand, it is said, were slaughtered in the Church of Mary Magdalen to which they had fled for asylum—When Arnaud (the Papal Legate and supreme commander) was asked whether the Catholics should be spared, he feared the heretics would escape by feigning orthodoxy, and fiercely replied, 'Kill them all, for God knows his own.'" (FTNOTE: Lea I: 154)

At Muret, September 13, 1213, fifteen to twenty thousand were massacred. At Marmande in 1218, five thousand, "without distinction of age or sex." (Lea I: 187) How easy to say it!

"In 1215 (FTNOTE: This was the year the English were promoting human freedom by wresting *Magna Charta* from King John.) the Fourth Council of the Lateran enjoined all rulers, as they desired to be faithful, to swear a public oath that they would labor earnestly, and to the full extent of their powers, to exterminate from their dominions all those who were branded as heretics by the Church." (Lecky: II:38)

Raymond lost two-thirds of his vast dominion and was deposed (?) in 1215; the other third, not yet conquered, was claimed by the Church to be held for his son when he became of age. But father and son (Raymond VII) fought on against repeated crusades. The father died in 1222.

Both sides finally being wearied, the end came April 12, 1229, when Raymond VII "humbly approached the legate and begged for reconciliation to the Church; barefooted and in his shirt he was conducted to the altar as a penitent, receiving absolution—and his followers were relieved from excommunication." (Lea, I:203) "The principles applied to Raymond of Toulouse were embodied in canon law, and every prince and noble was made to understand that his lands would be exposed to the spoiler if, after due notice, he hesitated in trampling out heresy." (Lea 5:226)

Here we may add that the chicanery and duplicity of papal politics throughout this whole Albigensian conflict form a further shameful and scandalous revelation of the lack of morals and integrity of the then highest spokesmen for God in the Christian world.

From 1252 to 1265 three popes, Innocent IV, Alexander IV, Urban IV, by the issuance, revision and re-issuance of

papal bulls established the Inquisition as supreme over the secular power in all lands "and it became the accepted maxim of law that all statutes interfering with the free action of the Inquisition were void, and those who enacted them were to be punished.—All the learning and wisdom of the land were made subservient to the supreme duty of suppressing heresy and were placed gratuitously at the service of the Inquisition." (Lea I:337-42)

Finally, the Raymond story is but a curtain raiser to centuries of religious violence and horrors then approaching in continental volume. The stage was rightly set only when such open defiance as Raymond's had clearly been broken and other European rulers thus warned of the danger of resisting the Church's will against heretics. From Pope Innocent III (1198) to Pope Pius XII (1800), a period three and three-quarter times as long as the present history of the United States from its beginning, there were eighty-three popes of whom at least forty-five appear in the histories of that period as promoting the persecution of heretics and witches. At least seventeen of them issued special papal bulls against these; all were generally supported by cardinals, archbishops, bishops, abbots, priests and monks. About 1230 the machinery of the Holy Inquisition was perfected, with Dominican and Franciscan monks as Inquisitors, with power and will to re-enact the Raymond story almost any place in Europe outside of Russia and Scandinavia if rulers failed to obey the papal commands. Property of heretics, always confiscated (even in cases where the heresy was discovered only long years after the heretic's death) was divided variously, but with the Church (or Bishop), the Inquisitors and the accusers getting their cuts.

"Not only were all Christians—made to feel that it was their highest duty to aid in the extermination of heretics, but they were taught that they must denounce them to the authorities regardless of all considerations, human or divine.

No tie of kindred served as an excuse for concealing heresy. The son must denounce the father, and the husband was guilty if he did not deliver his wife to a frightful death. Every human bond was severed by the guilt of heresy;—as Pope Innocent III emphatically phrased it, ‘according to the canons, faith is not to be kept with him who keeps not faith with God.’—if one is faithful to a heretic he is unfaithful to God.” (Lea I: 228)

All this conforms closely to the “commands of God as revealed” in the terrible verses of Deuteronomy xiii:6-18 and the words of Jesus in Matthew x:21,34-37 and in Exodus xxii:18. These words of Moses and Jesus doubtless were used thousands of times during those black centuries of domination by “His one true Church” to convince helpless religionists that God, by His Holy Word, thus commanded them to betray their loved ones to the tortures of the Inquisition.

Nothing more brutal, barbarous or sickening has ever been recorded than the stories of the methods of the Inquisitors in getting their evidence to convict heretics and witches of their guilt. In the name of God, and backed by God’s most authoritative representatives on earth: with thumbscrews, the rack, the boot, the scourge, the strap-pado, the chains of prison, starvation, confiscation and burning alive the bloody work went on.

During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, however, the Church’s great interest and activity centered on the eight great crusades against the Moslems to the partial exclusion of minor defections from the faith. By inheritance from these enormous death tolls, the Church became ever richer, more powerful, arrogant and corrupt from top to bottom, until with the beginning of the sixteenth century the storm of revulsion broke. Of the condition of the Church at that time Carlton J. H. Hayes, a Catholic historian, tells us:

“Nearly all thoughtful men in the sixteenth century

recognized the existence of abuses in the Catholic Church. The scandals connected with the papal court at Rome were notorious at the opening of the century. Several of the popes lived grossly immoral lives. Simony (the sale of Church offices for money) and nepotism (favoritism shown by a pope to his relatives) were not rare. The most lucrative ecclesiastical positions throughout Europe were frequently conferred upon Italians who seldom discharged their duties. —Leo X, who was pope when the Protestant revolt began, and son of Lorenzo de'Medici—had been ordained to the priesthood at the age of seven, named a cardinal when he was thirteen, and speedily loaded with a multitude of rich benefices and preferments; this same pope—created many new offices and shamelessly sold them—

“What immorality and worldliness prevailed at Rome was reflected in the lives of many lesser churchmen—

“Complaints against the evil lives of the clergy as well as against their ignorance and credulity were echoed by most of the great scholars and humanists of the time.” (A *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*. I: 127-8)

Returning to the early thirteenth century: Pursuit of the heretics continued in all lands. Burning alive for heresy was rare before the eleventh century though at Orleans in 1017 fifteen were burned; others in Milan in 1040; at Cologne in 1163; eighty Waldenses at Strassburg in 1212; hundreds in the Albigensian Crusades, 1209-1229. At the Lateran Council of 1215 Pope Innocent III secured a set of severe canon laws defining the Church’s attitude to heretics and the duties of the secular powers “to exterminate them under pain of forfeiture.” Then, between 1220 and 1239, Frederick II, to gain the favor of Pope Honorius III and secure his own coronation as emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, “enacted a complete and pitiless code of persecution based upon the Lateran canons. (laws laid down by the Roman Catholic hierarchy)—Heretics of all sects were out-

lawed; and when condemned as such by the Church they were to be delivered to the secular arm to be burned.—All the property of the heretic was confiscated and his heirs disinherited.” There were many other most terrible provisions.

“When the papal Inquisition was commenced, Frederick hastened, in 1232, to place the whole machinery of the state at the command of the inquisitors, who were authorized to call upon any official to capture whomsoever they might designate as a heretic and hold him until the Church should condemn him, when he was to be put to death.—This fiendish legislation was hailed by the Church with acclamation.—The whole series of edicts was subsequently promulgated by successive popes in repeated bulls, commanding all states to inscribe these laws irrevocably on their local statute books.” Finally these laws “were incorporated into the *Corpus Juris* as part of the canon law itself, and, technically speaking, they may be regarded as in force to the present day.” (Lea: I:320-22) This covered all Europe from Sicily to the North Sea and finally all Europe except the far north and Farthest Spain. “The enforcing of this legislation was the peculiar privilege of the inquisitors.” Yet outside of Italy these often had fierce jurisdictional strife with local bishops—mostly over confiscations. This we must pass.

GOD'S ELECT AND ANOINTED IN ACTION

IN ITALY

Italy was a loose group of small independent cities and states. Here was an age-long struggle between the popes and emperors for control of the Peninsula. The Ghibellines were those wanting an emperor and a Holy Roman Empire uniting all the Peninsula and Germany. The popes and their supporters, the Guelphs, wanted no such near, great rival

for power nor any union of the cities. Thus heretic groups could often hold a sort of balance of power with persecutions less violent and successful. Yet in Verona, in the 1230's, the Dominican Scio burned "in the public square sixty men and women of the principal families whom he had condemned as heretics." (Lea II:204)

In 1252 Pope Innocent IV in his bull, *ad extirpanda*, authorized the use of torture (by secular authorities) to obtain confessions of heresy. Church officials were prohibited from such acts until Pope Alexander IV in 1256 "authorized inquisitors and their associates to absolve each other, and mutually grant dispensations for irregularities." (Lea I: 421-22) Torture was then introduced in Naples, and soon generally everywhere.

Presently reports of inquisitorial bribery and extortion arose in north Italy and Pope Boniface complains "that these wrong-doers had not employed their illicit gains for the benefit of the Holy Office, or of the Roman Church, or even of their own order." (Lea I: 478)

Similar complaints came from all over Italy. Burning was often by-passed for extorted gold, one witness swearing to sixty-six such cases. Venice did not put the edicts of Frederick II on its books and strongly resisted the popes as did many of the cities of north Italy. Still torture and burnings went on sporadically. In the 1260's eleven were burned at Pavia; "In Piacenza it is said to have found the burning of twenty-eight wagon loads of heretics necessary." (*sic*) In a crusade, 1256, against heretics in Padua the city was captured and sacked; seventy were burned in Sermione in 1276; there were repeated crusades and wars against heretical Lombard cities and raids and massacres of Waldenses in the Piedmont valleys with homes razed and women and children perishing in the cold; at Ceni 22 were burned alive in the 1410's.

Sometimes the heretics were forced to give desperate resistance or die like sheep as in Florence where "two mur-

derous battles were fought—in both of which the heretics were utterly routed." (Lea:212)

When the popes would attack political opponents, or expand papal territory they could, and at times did, use the same methods as against heretics: as when Pope Clement V, 1309, ordered a crusade with confiscations against Ferrara, causing wars lasting eight years with horrible atrocities and uncountable losses on both sides. (Lea III:194-96)

Cardinal Robert of Geneva became later Pope Clement VII; but as papal legate aiding the territorial claims of Pope Gregory XI, 1376, he perpetrated "the terrible cold-blooded massacre of Cesena (ordering) all the inhabitants put to the sword without distinction of age or sex, after they had admitted him and his bandits, (Free Companions), into the city under his solemn oath that no injury should be inflicted on them. The number of the slain was estimated at five thousand." (Lea I:559; III:204)

One interesting incident: Savonarola, a puritanical, reformative priest of Florence and highly critical of churchly corruptions and abuses was finally excommunicated and, later, 1498, hanged and burned. When he was fighting for his life in 1497 the Cardinal of Siena (later Pope Pius III) offered to have the excommunication withdrawn on a payment of 5,000 scudi—an offer which Savonarola indignantly rejected. (Lea III:220)

IN THE BALKANS

In the Balkans the popes promoted wars and crusades of peoples against peoples, especially against Bosnia, a stronghold of Slavic heretics, the Cathari. Bosnia resisted fiercely for two hundred fifty years, though repeatedly laid waste by fire and sword. Bulgars, Hungarians and Turks were called on for help on either side from time to time. Thousands of heretics were killed or enslaved.

IN GERMANY AND BOHEMIA

There was no real "Germany" yet. What we call Germany comprised a loose aggregate of more than three hundred petty, independent, feudal states, duchies, counties and free cities, held together in an incoherent group by the title, Holy Roman Empire, under emperors elected by three feudal archbishops and four rulers of leading states. This empire aspired to include all Italy, too, hence its struggles with the popes. The Germanies were slow about putting those edicts of Frederick II on their books and as the archbishops and bishops were jealous of having the pope's inquisitors intrude on their own jurisdictions the (papal) inquisition advanced more slowly in the empire.

In 1231 a fanatic priest, Conrad of Marburg, whose "bigotry was ardent to the pitch of insanity" was given "almost illimitable power" by Pope Gregory IX—"he was not even required to hear the cases but only to pronounce judgment, which was to be final and without appeal;—he was authorized to command the aid of the secular arm, to excommunicate protectors of heresy, and to lay interdict on whole districts.—As officially reported—the accused was allowed simply the option of confessing what was demanded of him, and receiving penance, or of being burned for denial—which, in fact, was the essence of the inquisitorial process, reduced to its lowest terms." (Lea II:332-36)

Conrad and three assistants finally got into action among the nobility and presently all four were murdered. "Some chroniclers vaguely speak of (the number of his victims) as innumerable, and one asserts that a thousand unfortunates were burned.—this is probably an exaggeration (as his) insane activity cannot have exceeded (a year), yet the number must have been considerable to produce so profound an impression." (Lea II:341-46) In 1325 fifty Beghards were burned or drowned in the Rhine.

In 1347-9 the Black Death destroyed 25,000,000 lives in Europe. The Jews were widely blamed for this "wrath of God," to placate which they were massacred by the tens of thousands. In Bavaria alone the number was computed at twelve thousand. (Lea II:379) At Bingen in 1392 thirty-six Waldenses were burned; At Steyer in 1397 more than a hundred; in 1414 ninety-one Flagellantes at Sangerhausen and forty-four at Winkel, "and many more at other villages." In 1416 the inquisitor returned and as a result three hundred more were burned in one day. (Lea II:408)

In Bohemia the doctrines of the English Wyclif for Church reform and change in the doctrine and practices in holy communion had taken strong hold under John Huss. Also from 1378 the Church had been split. Two rival lines of popes, Italian and French, long claimed headship. Hence the great Church Council of Constance, lasting three years and five months from November 1, 1414, was called by Pope John XXIII to settle (1) this schism; to consider (2) reformation of the Church from its head downwards; (3) the Wyclifite, Hussite heresies in Bohemia and their leader there, John Huss, and other heresies.

Of this council Lea says: "From every part of Europe the Church sent its best and worthiest to take counsel together—The Universities poured forth their ablest doctors of theology and canon law. Princes and potentates were there in person or by their representatives—" (Lea II:454) In attendance were three hundred forty-six bishops and archbishops and five hundred sixty-four abbots and doctors besides sixty thousand five hundred attendants and visitors. "—an official census of the council, carefully taken, reports that the number (of public women) was not less than seven hundred.—" (Lea II:454)

Before this Council John Huss appeared voluntarily to defend himself, under guarantee by the emperor of safe conduct and full security. This was promptly violated and

he was thrown into prison. This Council finally united the Church (1417), failed to enact measures of Church reform, burned Huss (1415) and his collaborer, Jerome of Prague (1416), alive before their very eyes and "in February, 1418, decreed that all who should defend Hussitism—should be treated as relapsed heretics and punished with fire—*puniantur ad ignem.*" (Lea I:227)

These martyrdoms, trials and burnings of Huss and Jerome, constitute two of the most shameful and pathetic tragedies of all history. Yet the day after Huss was burned "thanks were returned to God in a solemn procession in which figured (the Emperor) Sigismund and his queen, the princes and nobles, nineteen cardinals, two patriarchs, seventy-seven bishops and all the clergy of the council." (Lea II:493)

Six months later four hundred fifty Bohemian nobles rebelled—a forecast of the Lutheran revolution in Germany, with Luther yet unborn for sixty-eight more years.

Pope Martin V proclaimed a crusade to crush Bohemia, the crusaders hoping to win large estates by confiscation. For fifteen years these assaults were resisted successfully but in 1434 the Hussites became divided. One sect, the Calixtins, joined the Catholics; a second, the Taborites, was practically destroyed—twenty-two thousand in one place, thirteen thousand in another. (Lea II: 535-6) Yet for a century more the struggle went on.

Before the Lutheran Revolt, God's Dominion was in a bad enough way in Europe with at least thirty-five differing heretical sects, all resting their faith and differences on God's Holy Word. After the Revolution had established itself, say by 1555, there were added the Lutherans, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Puritans, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Quakers, and later the 57 varieties of Protestantism we now know, all based on the same Inspired Word. To Catholicism all these were at once heretical and now real hell broke

loose with religious wars all over Europe for the next hundred years and more, with massacres, torturings, burnings and reprisals, all in apparent fulfillment of the words of Jesus, Matthew x:34-37; Luke xii:51-53.

IN FRANCE

After the Albigensian Crusades, burnings still went on. As one pitiful case: In Toulouse, 1234, an old heretic woman lay dying, expecting a visit from her own bishop. By error a Catholic bishop and a prior were brought in. Unwittingly she confessed to them. Ordered to recant she refused—"he (the bishop) summoned the viguer (provost or sheriff), condemned her as a heretic, and had the satisfaction of seeing the dying creature carried off on her bed and burned at the place of execution." (Lea II:11)

But it was not all burnings: Catholics, too, were punished for trifling contacts with, or civilities to, heretics. In south France a doctor binds up a heretic's arm—is sent on pilgrimages to Puy, St. Gilles, Compostello. A woman eats at a table with heretics—the same three pilgrimages. A man who as a boy of twelve had seen heretics, another who as a boy had spent part of a day and night with heretics, a woman who had seen some in her father's house, all were sent on pilgrimages. A list of seven hundred twenty-four such penances was decreed on a circuit by one inquisitor, Pierre Cellar, in about five months the winter of 1241-2. Four hundred twenty-seven of these were pilgrimages to the Compostella shrine, four or five hundred miles away in N. W. Spain over mountainous roads.

Thus "people were to be taught that the toleration which had existed for generations was at an end—that the heretic was to be tracked and captured like a wild beast, or at least to be shunned like a leper—(There was) a terror common to all when the rumor spread that the inquisitor was

coming.—The inquisitor would pass calmly on, leaving a neighborhood well-nigh depopulated—father and mothers despatched to distant shrines for months or years, leaving dependent families to starve, or harvests ungathered to be the prey of the first comer.” (Lea II:30-33)

Here we might well pause, reflect, try to conceive the social system in which such things could occur. Here in profusion we find God, religion, the Church and the clergy. Would you want to live and rear your family in a community (with or) without those influences?

In 1242 two inquisitors and their nine helpers were murdered. Repress your applause! There were reprisals, a crusade, a siege and in March 1244 two hundred five heretics, both sexes, were burned at one time. (Lea II:35-43)

Our old acquaintance, Raymond VII, now wholly reconciled with the Church, “in a fit of piety which preceded his death in 1249, caused eighty believers in heresy to be burned at Berlaiges—after they had confessed their errors in his presence.” (Lea I:537)

Through the thirteenth century both Church and State grew stronger, but the State more rapidly; French kings, and English, too, proving their superior power. In the fourteenth century the Church’s decline was clearly on. A French king moves the papal seat to Avignon where it stays from 1305 to 1376. This, the Black Death (1347-9), and the Great Schism (1378-1417) weaken it still more. In the fourteenth century pope and king at times co-operate in exploitations. Pope John XXII and King Charles IV of France “split the take” from a levy on the French churches in 1326. After John’s death (1334) an inventory revealed in his treasury “eighteen millions of gold florins and jewels and vestments estimated at seven millions more.” (Lea III:68) This in a day when gold was scarce; and all paid, ultimately, out of the toil of the poor in exchange for the hope of an escape from hell and a share in the Church’s undiminishing and unlimited supply of eternal salvation.

CHAPTER VIII

FRANCE GROWS IN POWER

From 1337 to 1453 France and England fought territorial wars for lands now French soil, with the martyrdom of Joan of Arc (1431) to match the tragedy of John Huss. Of this Robinson says: "She was tried by a court of clergymen, found guilty and burned at Rouen in 1431." (*Mediaeval and Modern Times*, p. 138) Thorndyke says: "She was—tried—by a large ecclesiastical court—The trial was unfair and she was unfairly dealt with in prison. She was condemned as a heretic and burned at the stake." (*History of Mediaeval Europe*, p. 529) (FOOTNOTE: For details of the horrible unfairness see Mark Twain's *Joan of Arc*.)

At Meaux, France, September 8, 1546, Picard, a Doctor of the Sorbonne (the theological school of the University of Paris), preached a sermon over the ashes of fourteen Lutheran heretics burned alive, saying: "—it was essential to the salvation of all to believe that these fourteen condemned persons were damned in the bottomless pit of hell; —God would not be God if he did not damn them to eternity." * (Th. Beze, Ecclesiastical Hist. Bk I, p. 51-53. Quoted in Pardoe, Francis I, King of France, Vol II, pp. 367-69.) This quite echoes Pope Gregory I, The Great, (590-604) who "argued that the bliss of the elect in heaven would not be perfect unless they were able to look across the abyss and enjoy the agonies of their bretheren in eternal

fire. This idea was a popular one and was not allowed to grow obsolete.—(One) leading authority on the schools quotes St. Gregory with approbation, and enlarges upon the satisfaction the just will feel in the ineffable misery of the damned." (Lea I: 240-41)

As the Protestant Revolution gathered strength, the last two Dukes of Guise and the last three generations of the Valois branch of the Capetian line of the French kings (all Catholic) did what they could to destroy it in France. In 1545 Francis I "became so intolerant that he ordered the massacre of three thousand defenseless peasants—whose only offense was adherence to the simple teachings of the Waldensians. Francis's son, Henry II (1547-59) swore to extirpate the Protestants, and hundreds of them were burned."—In 1563 Francis, Duke of Guise, massacred a group of Huguenots (French Presbyterians, followers of Calvin) at worship in a barn on a Sunday. This started a war in which "as in the other religious wars of the time, both sides exhibited the most inhuman cruelty. France was filled for a generation with burnings, pillage, and every form of barbarity." (Robinson: *Medieval and Modern Times*, pp. 337-344)

On St. Bartholomew's Eve and Day, August 23, 1572, Henry's widow, Catherine de Medici, as queen regent for Henry's three weak, childless sons, gave the signal to the Catholic party under the Guises, a duke and a cardinal, for a massacre of the Huguenots. In Paris 2,000 were killed; for outside the city the estimates run from a 10,000 minimum to 70 and even 100 thousand. "Pope Gregory XIII had this blood bath celebrated jubilantly," "a *Te Deum* was sung before the whole College of Cardinals." (Zoff: *The Huguenots*, p. 143)

Finally, in proof of the wholly unreconstructed nature of Catholicism in general, and as a fundamental consideration in planning a world civilization for today and tomorrow:

"As late as 1899 there was published a fresh edition of the *Theologia dogmatica et moralis* used in sixty-seven Catholic theological seminaries in France (containing) the following words: 'The Church has received from God the power to force or repress those who wander from the truth, not only by spiritual penalties, but also by temporal ones.—These are prison, flagellation, torture, mutilation, death'" (Bracq: France under the Republic, p. 268. Quoted in Cadoux, *Roman Catholicism and Freedom*, 3d ed. p. 34, 1937)

IN THE NETHERLANDS

Prior to 1521 there was no established Inquisition in the Netherlands. Van der Hulst, appointed by Emperor Charles V, was commissioned by Pope Adrian VI in July, 1523 as "universal and general inquisitor for all the Netherlands." In 1525 Pope Clement VII confirmed three other inquisitors in his place. In 1537 Pope Paul III appointed two others to replace one of those who died. (Motley: *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, I, pp. 400-03)

"Nowhere was the persecution of heretics more relentless than in the Netherlands. Suspected persons were subjected to various torturing but ridiculous ordeals. After such trial, death by fire was the usual but perhaps not the most severe form of execution. In Flanders, monastic ingenuity had invented another most painful punishment for Waldenses and similar malefactors. A criminal whose guilt had been established—was stripped and bound to the stake; he then was flayed from the neck to the navel, while swarms of bees were let loose to—torture him to a death of exquisite agony." (Motley I, 85)

Here follow many pages of a most terrible indictment of the Netherlands' clergy to which the reader is referred. On page 97 Motley tells us: "Another edict published in the

Netherlands forbids all private assemblies for devotion; all reading of the scriptures; all discussions within one's own doors concerning faith, the sacraments, the papal authority, or other religious matter under penalty of death. The edicts were no dead letter. The fires were kept constantly supplied with human fuel by monks who knew the art of burning reformers better than that of arguing with them. The scaffold was the most conclusive of syllogisms, and used upon all occasions. Still the people remained unconvinced. Thousands of burned heretics had not made a single convert." (Motley I:97)

In 1535 an imperial edict was issued at Brussels condemning all heretics to death; repentant males to be executed with the sword, repentant females to be buried alive, the obstinate of both sexes to be burned. This and similar edicts were the law of the land for twenty years and rigidly enforced. (*ibid* p. 100)

Robinson substantially confirms this, adding: "In either case their property was to be confiscated. The lowest estimate of those who were executed in the Netherlands during Charles's reign is fifty thousand." (M and M Times p. 334) Grotius (1583-1645), a Dutch historian, says a hundred thousand.

In 1556 Charles V, grandson of the Emperor Maximilian (Hapsburg) and of Ferdinand and Isabella (Spain), himself the King of Spain and Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, abdicated his powers, giving to his brother all of the Germanies and to his son, Philip II of Spain, Spain and the Netherlands, urging Philip to "prove worthy—by living in the fear of God, and by maintaining law, justice and the Catholic religion in all their purity—" (Motley I:135)

Four years later Philip recalls this, refers to the "new, reprobate and damnable sects" and commands his regent "for the sake of religion and glory of God, *accurately and exactly to cause to be enforced the edicts and decrees made*

by his imperial Majesty (Charles), and renewed by his present Majesty, for the extirpation of all sects and heresies.”
(Motley I:263-4)

After enduring this until 1566 some five hundred nobles protested this policy whereupon Philip sent to Spain for the Duke of Alva and an army of Spanish soldiers. “Upon the 16th of February, 1568, a sentence of the Holy Office condemned all the inhabitants of the Netherlands to death as heretics. From this universal doom only a few persons especially named were excepted. A proclamation of the king, dated ten days later, confirmed this decree of the Inquisition, and ordered it to be carried into instant execution—Three million people, men, women and children, were sentenced to the scaffold in three (written) lines.”
(Motley II: 155) Until 1573 there was a veritable reign of blood and terror.

It thus came to:—Die like sheep, or revolt. The Netherlands revolted. The struggle was long and filled with indescribable horrors. Not until 1648 was her independence acknowledged. For the terrible details, see Motley. Only in Spain was the course of the Inquisition comparable with that in the Netherlands.

* * *

THE CATHOLICS IN SPAIN

The words “Spanish Inquisition” have become the common phrase throughout the civilized world for the ultimate in human cruelty and horror. Motley in his history says of it (I:395-7) “—In course of time—it taught the savages of India and America to shudder at the name of Christianity—It was a bench of monks without appeal—diving into the secrets of every fireside, judging and executing its horrible decrees without responsibility.—It arrested on suspicion, tortured till confession, and then punished by fire. Two witnesses, and those to separate facts, were sufficient to con-

fine the victim to a loathesome dungeon—did he persist in the avowal of his innocence, two witnesses sent him to the stake, one witness to the rack.—the victim—whether man, matron or tender virgin—was stripped naked, and stretched upon a wooden bench. Water, weights, fires, pulleys, screws—all the apparatus by which the sinews could be strained without cracking, the bones crushed without breaking—was now put into operation.

“The period during which torture might be inflicted from day to day was unlimited—It could only be terminated by confession, so that the scaffold was the sole refuge from the rack. Individuals have borne the torture and the dungeon fifteen years, and have been burned at the stake at the last.”

Catholic apologists strive to evade responsibility, to shift it to King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella who used the Inquisition for state purposes. They ignore the fact that for centuries the Church had been laboring for monopolistic control over Jews, Moors and other non-Catholic groups and had failed because of mutual tolerance. Their claims depend on papal bulls not followed by papal acts to make good the words. What followed was a totalitarian cooperation of Church and State. Careful historical analysis does not absolve the Church from responsibility. Jews and Moors were finally expelled with horrible sufferings and their property was confiscated.

Lee devotes four volumes to *The History of the Inquisition in Spain*. The reader is referred. We by-pass Lee and for Spain make minimum reference to Lecky’s History of the *Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe*, in two volumes. Lecky is reviled by Catholic writers as prejudiced, unfair, outdated, anti-Catholic. But he documents all his statements; his facts and conclusions are sustained by other non-Catholic historians. Many of his references, and Lee’s as well, are to Catholic sources. When he comes to the rise

of Protestantism Lecky is unbiased and shows how the various Protestant sects persecuted each other, the Catholics, other heretics and the witches, though less effectively because less powerful. Lecky tells us:

“That the Church of Rome has shed more innocent blood than any other institution that has ever existed among mankind will be questioned by no Protestant who has a competent knowledge of history.—Llorente, who had free access to the archives of the Spanish Inquisition, assures us that by that tribunal alone more than thirty-one thousand persons were burnt, and more than two hundred ninety thousand condemned to punishments less severe than death. (FOOT-NOTE: This does not include those who perished by branches of the Spanish Inquisition in Mexico, Lima, Cartagena, the Indies, Sicily, Sardina, Oran and Malta.)—When we recollect that after the mission of Dominic the area of persecution comprised nearly the whole of Christendom and that its triumph in many districts was so complete as to destroy every memorial of the contest; the most callous nature must recoil with horror from the spectacle. For these atrocities were not perpetuated in the brief paroxysms of a reign of terror, or by the hands of obscure secretaries, but were inflicted by a triumphant Church with every circumstance of solemnity and deliberation. Nor did the victims perish by a brief and painless death,—they were usually burnt alive. They were burnt alive not infrequently by a slow fire. They were burnt alive after their constancy had been tried by the most excruciating agonies that minds fertile in torture could devise. This was the physical torment inflicted on those who dared to exercise their reason in the pursuit of truth.” (Lecky, revised edition II, 40-43)

“The monks, the Inquisitors, and in general the mediaeval clergy—were the men who were at once the instigators and agents of that horrible, detailed persecution that stained almost every province of Europe with the blood of Jews

and heretics, and which exhibits an amount of cold, passionless, studied and deliberate barbarity unrivalled in the history of mankind.—In every prison the crucifix and the rack stood side by side and in almost every country the abolition of torture was at last effected by a movement which the Church opposed and by men whom she had cursed.” (Lecky I:330-32)

IN ENGLAND

The topics here cited form no truly logical group. But a blood diet, too prolonged, brings revulsion. I hope only to be able to condense the pertinent remnants of this study into a properly informative minimum of time and space. But let us remember that we are not studying religious persecutions as such; we are pursuing pragmatically, and in its negative aspect, the effect of the God-idea on, and its relationship to, human morals. Is the Idea or its pursuit needed for, conducive to, productive of, development of a moral sense or moral stability in man?

How not but that such a study as this of the operation of the God-idea on the minds of millions of its most avowed and devoted holders over continents, for centuries, should lead us to a true definite answer to our question? For we must not forget that it is a religious sectarian claim that all heresy is “sin in the eyes of God,” an offense against him according to “His Word;” that it is God’s agency, the Church, and God’s (self-)accredited agents, the popes, cardinals, archbishops, clergy and monks who are the active instruments in its pursuit, discovery, conviction, assessment of penalty and guarantee of execution.

Here be it noted, however, that it is no part of the office of the present study to conceal, enlarge upon, or even to mention the good acts or good results of any “God-fearing” persons or groups. Such acts arise (see ch. II) out of the natural social instincts inherent in multitudes, account for

themselves naturally and call for no presence of any God-idea to explain them; for clearly multitudes who definitely reject the God-idea have equally good records for socially welcome activities. The task here, rather, is to show how "universally" a possession of (or by) the God-idea, however devoutly held, has failed to curb unsocial acts of persons with unsocial minds or wills—that such possession even seems to exacerbate such unsocial wills when they feel "God's will" *accords with theirs*.

* * *

In England the Roman Inquisition was never papal, only episcopal (under the bishops); and the arch-bishops, bishops and kings often co-operated widely for mutual aid. But as feudalism declined the kings gained power increasingly over the bishops and the Church.

In 1166 Henry II and a council of bishops at Oxford condemned thirty heretics, scourged them, branded them in the face with a hot key and drove them out shelterless in winter to perish miserably one by one. (Lea I: 113-14)

Under Edward III (1327-77) "The religious revival of the Lollards was trodden out in blood, while the Church (Catholic) shriveled to a self-seeking, secular priesthood." (Green: *A Short History of the English People*. 248)

In 1401 under Henry IV the statute *de haeretico comburendo* was made an English law. *The Dictionary of English History* says of this: "It was enacted on the urgent petition of the clergy.—Archbishop (of Canterbury) Arundel was the prime mover in the matter." Under "this infamous act bishops could arrest and imprison, so long as their heresy should last, all preachers (and teachers and writers) of heresy,—but a refusal to abjure, or a relapse after abjuration, enabled them to hand over the heretic to the civil officers, and by those—he was to be burned in a high place before the people." Almost immediately a Lollard preacher, William Sawtree, was burned, and a layman, John Badbie, for denying transubstantiation.

Under Henry V thirty-nine prominent Lollards were hung up and burned in 1419. Later Lord Cobham who had befriended them "was hung alive in chains and a slow fire kindled beneath his feet." (Green 280) Persecution finally destroyed the sect. John Fox(e) in his *Book of Martyrs* lists by name and date forty others subsequently burned and six as "executed" for heresy between 1428 and 1534. Of these six were condemned by archbishops, eighteen by bishops, one by a chancellor, one by clergy, the rest not specified; four were women, one eighty years old.

John Colet, Catholic, Dean of St. Paul's, London, told a Convocation of the clergy about 1520: "No heresy—is so fatal to us and to the people—as the depraved lives of the clergy." (Green, 323)

Henry VIII (1509-47) cut off all power, revenues and authority in England from the Pope of Rome (1533-4), confiscated all Church property in England and created a new Church, the Anglican, with himself and his successors as its supreme head with all the autocratic, totalitarian powers of both king and pope. Religion and politics became indistinguishable; but State became supreme over Church. As Henry remained essentially Catholic at heart his Anglican Church did not join the new body of Lutheran reformers then rising in the Germanies, nor other Protestants. Except as to the supremacy of the pope, its "Six Articles (1539) reaffirmed the chief points in Catholic doctrine and practice and visited dissenters with horrible punishment.—the Catholic who denied the royal supremacy was beheaded; on the other hand the Protestant who denied transubstantiation was burned! It has been estimated that during the reign of Henry VIII the number of capital condemnations for politico-religious offenses ran into the thousands—an inquisition that in terror and bloodshed is comparable to that of Spain." (Hayes: *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe*. I:153)—a Catholic writer.

Thomas Cranmer, destined from boyhood for a clerical

life, a man of great ability and attainments, confirmed by Pope Clement VII as Archbishop of Canterbury (1533-53), promptly forsook the Pope and became Henry's Man Friday. A servile, hypocritical, time-serving, double-dealing man, himself disbelieving in transubstantiation, he nevertheless supported Henry's ardent belief in the "Real Presence" and burned other such disbelievers as heretics. "The repeal of the Statute of Heresy (of 1401) left the powers of common law intact and Cranmer availed himself of these to send heretics of the last class (those who denied 'the very Godhead of the Founder of Christianity') without mercy to the stake . . ." (Green: 366)

Hume cites three men and a woman burned in 1546 (Henry VIII) for the transubstantiation heresy, all refusing to accept pardons at the last moment on condition that they should recant. (*History of England*, III, 212-13)

When the ten-year-old Edward VI (1547-53), under a Protestant Council of Regency, succeeded Henry, many of Henry's terrible laws were repealed. Cranmer moved strongly to eliminate Catholic practices from the English Church; to put it on a more nearly Protestant (Calvinistic) basis and met with considerable success. But Edward lived only six years and his Catholic half-sister, "Bloody" Mary (1553-58), followed. Catholics at once swarmed back into power in Church and State and the terrible laws of heresy repealed under Henry (the law of 1401) and Edward (the Six Articles and others) were re-enacted.

Mary promptly set about to restore England to papal dominion but England had tasted enough freedom to resist this firmly. Mary could be England's Queen and Church Head, and Catholic rites and customs could be restored in her churches, but no more of the pope.

Her Council was presided over by Gardiner, Bishop of Manchester, who "pressed busily on the work of death." (Green, 371) Its victims were generally delivered to Bonner, Bishop of London, for execution. Gardiner died and

Bonner “grew sick of his work” but “the Queen roused the lagging prelates to fresh persecution, and in three months fifty victims were hurried to their doom.—The sufferers were sent in batches to the flames. In a single day thirteen victims, two of them women, were burned at Stratford-le-Bow. Seventy-three Protestants of Colchester were dragged through the streets of London tied to a single rope.” (Green, 372-74) During the last three years of Mary’s five-year reign the total martyr deaths were four hundred; two hundred ninety of these (Hume says 277) were burned alive. (J. Mackintosh: *Hist. of Eng.*, II: ch. 11) Among these “were five bishops, twenty-one (Anglican?) clergymen—fifty-five women and four children.” (Hume: *Hist. of Eng.* III:345)

Among these five bishops was Cranmer who first recanted and repudiated all his opposition to pope and Catholic Church—a sorry contrast to many of his own victims who died defiant. When he found his abjectness would not save him he recanted his recantation and died without flinching. This reversion of Mary’s together with the Church’s shocking atrocities across in the Netherlands did much to alienate England permanently from Catholicism.

PROTESTANT PERSECUTIONS

As printing increased the common folk grew biblically-minded. In England and Scotland many new sects of religious reformers arose: Presbyterians, Puritans, Covenanters, Quakers and other Non-conformists, with their own leaders and biblical interpretations. These added their own to the Catholic resistance against Anglicanism until all were largely fighting each other. The Quakers (Friends), who never struck back, became the easiest victims. During the 16th and 17th centuries the British Isles under the Tudors and Stuarts became a religious mad house with religion and politics scarcely distinguishable. This is always the danger with any religious supremacy.

From early days the Anglicans had a fine of a shilling per Sunday (later raised to £20. per month) against any adult who failed to attend the official Church; with prison and property-confiscation to back it. This was enforced with varying emphasis according to varying religio-political acrimony.

Queen Elizabeth (1558-1603) was essentially non-religious but was disposed to indulge in a sort of religious truce until Pope Pius V in 1570 excommunicated and deposed her, absolved her subjects from allegiance and encouraged Spain, France and Scotland to attack her. When Jesuit missionaries swarmed in soon thereafter she began reprisals and beheaded some two hundred Jesuits and Catholic priests—all, she insisted, on political grounds of treason; not on religious grounds.

Spain's Great Armada of a hundred thirty war ships against heretical England in 1588 was in essence but a repetition in large of the Albigensian Crusade of the 1220's, and helped widen her breach with Catholicism.

In 1584 Elizabeth established an Ecclesiastical Commission with power to reform all errors, regulate all opinions, punish all breach of uniformity in the exercise of public worship etc. This "converted the religious truce into a spiritual despotism—(Its) powers were practically left in the hands of the successive Primates. No Archbishop of Canterbury since Augustine had wielded an authority so vast, so utterly despotic, as that of Parker (1559), and Whitgift, and Bancroft and Abbot and Laud (beheaded by the Puritans 1645). It is no wonder that the Ecclesiastical Commission, which those men represented, soon stank in the nostrils of the English clergy—all preaching or reading in private houses was forbidden." (Green, 465)

Protestant persecutions, says Lecky, "were never so sanguinary as those of Catholics but the principle was affirmed quite as strongly, was acted on quite as constantly, and was defended quite as pertinaciously by the clergy." Under

Queen Elizabeth a law forbade "any religions other than the (Anglican) Prayer Book," a third offense bringing imprisonment for life. "The Presbyterians through a long series of reigns were imprisoned, branded, mutilated, scourged and exposed in the pillory. Many Catholics under false pretenses were tortured and hung. Anabaptists and Arians were burnt alive.—In Scotland, during almost the whole period that the Stuarts were on the throne of England, a persecution rivaling in atrocity almost any on record was directed by the English Government, at the instigation of the Scotch bishops, and with the approbation of the English Church, against all who repudiated episcopacy. The Presbyterians were hunted like criminals over the mountains. Their ears were torn from their roots. They were branded with hot irons. Their fingers were wrenched asunder by thumbkins. The bones of their legs were shattered in the boots." (Lecky, II: 46-48)

But in 1553 Calvin, in Switzerland, founder of Presbyterianism, had burned Michael Servetus at the stake for his views on the Trinity; a deed approved by the famous scholar Melancthon, friend of Luther. John Knox, founder of Scotch Presbyterianism, fathered laws in 1560 for the death of those attending Catholic worship for a third time. In England persecution forced the Puritans and Presbyterians into substantial union. The Bible became their supreme authority, replacing the voice of God's vice-gerent, the pope. Thomas Cartwright, a Professor of Divinity at Cambridge and a fanatical Calvinist (1588) held the absolute rule of Presbyters to be established by the Word of God and advocated for England "a scheme of ecclesiastical government which placed the State beneath the feet of the (Presbyterian) Church.—With the despotism of a Hildebrand (Pope Gregory VII), Cartwright combined the cruelty of a Torquemada (Head of the Spanish Inquisition).—all other forms—were to be ruthlessly put down. For heresy there was the punishment of death. Never had the

doctrine of persecution been urged with such a blind and reckless ferocity. ‘I deny,’ wrote Cartwright, ‘that upon repentance there ought to follow any pardon of death.—Heretics ought to be put to death now. If this be bloody and extreme, I am content to be so counted with the Holy Ghost.’” (Green, 463)

“The absolute devotion of the Puritan to a Supreme Will tended more and more to rob him of all sense of measure and proportion in common matters—Life became hard, rigid, colorless as it became intense—In the inner soul of the Puritan, sense, reason, judgment were overborne by the terrible reality of ‘invisible things.’” (Green, 461) With Bible for law book he sought to establish his idea of the Kingdom of God on earth by force: No May-pole or other dancing, no theatres, no Christmas trees, no mince pies at Christmas, no holly wreathes, no Sunday sports, no giving of a ring at marriage, no organs in the churches, no stained glass windows, no beauty, no pleasure!

By 1647-8 the Long Parliament (Puritan-Presbyterian-controlled) passed a law that “Any man denying the doctrine of the Trinity or of the Divinity of Christ, or that the books of Scripture are not ‘The Word of God,’ or the resurrection of the body, or a future day of judgment, and refusing on trial to abjure his heresy, ‘shall suffer the pain of death.’” (Green, 553)

To the growing spirit in the common man the Stuart kings and their bishops steadily opposed their ideas of the Divine right of kings and bishops. They were accountable to God alone.

“Bishop Andrews declared James (I; 1603-25) to have been inspired of God.” High Church men under James “preached passive obedience to the worst tyranny. They declared the person and goods of the subject to be at the King’s absolute disposal. They turned religion into a systematic attack on English liberty.” (Green, 494) Charles I (1625-49) told Parliament they were altogether in his

power—"as I find (their) fruits to be good or evil they are to continue or not to be." When it denied him, he dissolved it. "Dr. Mainwaring preached before Charles himself that the King needed no Parliamentary warrant for taxation and that to resist his will was to incur eternal damnation." (Green, 489-90) Archbishop Laud, determined to establish his idea of the Kingdom of God on earth by force, had stopped at nothing in his contempt for the dignity of man. At least 21,000 Quakers (Friends) were imprisoned for defying his Anglican power and will, hundreds dying from the brutalities. A civil war between the King and the Long Parliament finally took these ideas out of the heads of Laud (1645) and Charles (1649) with an ax.

All the Quakers were seeking was civil rights, liberty of conscience, abolition of slavery, an end to wars, prison reforms, women's right and such-like humane ends, albeit with an occasional foolish one or two.

In Ireland in these days there were terrible massacres, Protestants by Catholics and Catholics by Cromwell's Puritans running to many thousands on both sides. A Puritan soldier dying on the battle field complained to Cromwell "that God had not suffered him to be any more the executioner of his enemies." (Green, 538)

LUTHER

In Germany, where most of the feudal lords were supporting Luther's break with the Catholic Church and confiscating its lands, the peasants, serfs for centuries, took his reforms broadly and revolted (1525). They demanded an end to serfdom and arbitrary punishments, wages for extra services, the right to fish and hunt—twelve reforms in all. These being resisted the revolt turned to murder, pillage and arson on a large scale. Luther then "took the side of the princes and lords and issued a sanguinary and ill-judged appeal to a war of extermination against the rebels." The

rising was “ruthlessly repressed. The princes and lords” took “savage retribution, of which many thousands of their subjects became victims.” (Britannica: Art. Luther.) “—it is estimated that ten thousand peasants were put to death, many with the utmost cruelty.—The old exactions of the lords—were in no way lightened, and the situation of the serfs for centuries following—was worse rather than better.” (Robinson 305) Luther’s “appeal,” not given by Britannica, was to consign the peasants to hell-fire and to call to the nobles: “Whoever can, should smite, strangle or stab, secretly or publicly.” (Hayes: *History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I, p. 135, McMillan)

THE WITCHES

The field of witchcraft again offers a continent and centuries for a study of the pragmatic effect of the God-Idea on human morals. Does it help develop and improve man’s moral nature? Will our new study supplement and support the findings of our earlier quest?

Belief in witchcraft and sorcery came down to us out of antiquity. In those pre-scientific days of prevailing ignorance these were deemed the causes of men’s diseases and many other ills. The Christian bible testifies often to the Devil, his power and works, and to evil spirits. It tells us that Jesus talked with the Devil, was tempted by him, and repeatedly “cast out” devils to heal men; that “an enchanter, a witch—a wizard—are an abomination to the Lord,” (Deuteronomy xviii:10-12); that (as quoted earlier): “Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.” (Deut. xxii:19). Here a definite, biblical basis for persecution lies before us. Did God’s agents follow this lead?

At least three popes: Innocent VIII, Julius II, Adrian VI, issued bulls against witchcraft. Martin Luther declared: “I would have no compassion on these witches, I would burn them all.” In Scotland the persecution of witches under

the Reformed ministers was "atrocious." As late as 1768 John Wesley, lead-founder of Methodism, said: "—the English in general, and indeed most of the men of learning in Europe, have given up all accounts of witches—as mere old-wives fables. I am sorry for it—They will know (whether Christians know it or not) that the giving up of witchcraft is in effect giving up the Bible." (Quoted by Lecky (I:140) from Wesley's Journal.)

Lea tells us: "Hideous as are the details of the persecution of witchcraft—up to the fifteenth century, they were but a prelude to the blind and senseless orgies of destruction that disgraced the next century, and half Christendom seemed to have gone delirious—Protestant and Catholic rivaling each other in the madness of the horror. Witches were burned no longer in ones and twos but in scores and hundreds. A bishop of Geneva is said to have burned 500 within three months, a bishop of Hamburg 600, a bishop of Wurzburg 900." For a late, cold spring in 1586 which "could only be the result of witchcraft—the Archbishop of Treves burned at Pfalz 118 women and 2 men.—Paramo (an Inquisitor) boasts that in a century and a half from—1404, the Holy office had burned at least 30,000 witches who, if they had been left unpunished, would easily have brought the whole world to destruction." (Lea III: 548-49)

Lecky tells us: "The clergy denounced it (witchcraft) with all the emphasis of authority. The legislators of almost every land enacted laws for its punishment.—Tens of thousands of victims perished by the most agonizing and protracted torments—In almost every province of Germany, but especially in those where clerical influence predominated, the persecution raged with a fearful intensity. Seven thousand victims are said to have been burned at Treves, (Bamberg given as above), and eight hundred in a single year in the bishopric of Wurtzburg. (footnote: Lea, above, says 900, as does H. E. Barnes: *Intellectual and Cultural*

History of the Western World,) "At Toulouse, the seat of the Inquisition, four hundred persons perished for sorcery at a single execution, and fifty at Douay in a single year. Rany, a judge of Nancy, boasted that he had put to death eight hundred witches in sixteen years. The executions that took place in Paris in a few months were 'almost infinite.' The fugitives who escaped to Spain were there seized and burned by the Inquisition. In that country the persecution spread to the smallest towns,—In Italy a thousand persons were executed in a single year in Como; and in other parts of the country, the severity of the inquisitors at last created an absolute rebellion. The same scenes were enacted in the wild valleys of Switzerland and Savoy. (Geneva confirmed as above); forty-eight were burnt at Constance or Ravensburg, and eighty in the little town of Valery, in Savoy. In 1670 seventy persons were condemned in Sweden, and a large proportion of them were burnt. And these are only a few of the more salient events in that long series of persecutions which extended over almost every country and continued for centuries with unabated fury. The Church of Rome proclaimed in every way that was in her power the reality and the continued existence of the crime. She strained every nerve to stimulate the persecution. She taught by all her organs that to spare a witch was a direct insult to the Almighty.—Almost all the great works—in favor of the executions were written by ecclesiastics.—Ecclesiastical tribunals condemned thousands to death, and countless bishops exerted all their influence to multiply the victims. In a word, for many centuries it was universally believed that the continued existence of witchcraft formed an integral part of the teaching of the church and that the persecution that ran through Europe was supported by the whole stress of infallibility." (Lecky, I, p. 32)

In the famous case of Joan of Arc: The English “declared and undoubtedly believed that she was a witch who

had been helped by the devil. She was tried by a court of clergymen, found guilty, and burned at Rouen in 1431." (Robinson, Mediaeval and Modern Times, 138)

Prof. Harry Elmer Barnes tells us: "In the more than two centuries that separate the papal bull of 1484 (the *Summis desiderates* of Innocent VIII) from Cotton Mather and the Salem (witch) trials in the American colonies when twenty were executed for witchcraft in 1692 within fifteen miles of what is now Boston, it is estimated by Withington that a quarter of a million persons were put to death for witchcraft—that is they died under torture or were executed after confession.—In addition to the hundreds of thousands brutally executed many millions lived in continuous mortal fear lest they be accused and hideously tortured." (*An Intellectual and Cultural History of the Western World*. First revised edition, p. 592)

In Scotland the clergy ardently supported the belief and were among the last to give it up. "As late as 1773, 'the divines of the Associated Presbytery' passed a resolution declaring their belief in witchcraft and deplored the scepticism that was general." (Macauley, *History of England*, III: 706; quoted by Lecky, *History of Rationalism*, I:151)

* * *

When through the slow growth of Rationalism enlightenment finally came to the world, the clergy were the last to part with the grand hallucination.

INDIA

From the dawn of history India has been the most religion-and-priest-ridden land in the world. For 3,500 years it has been dominated by an iron-bound, hereditary caste system, established by the priest-made Hindu scriptures and controlling all occupations and marriages. According to these scriptures the priestly caste (Brahmans) emanated from the mouth of God (Brahma); lower castes from his

arms, thighs and feet. Below these are the pariahs, the untouchables—servants of servants. A United Press dispatch of May 4, 1947 from New Delhi will close our India exhibit:

“Orthodox Brahmin priests and Sedhu ascetics squatted outside—in relays today, waving their yellow flags marked with the sacred Swastica of Hinduism and chanting: ‘Don’t let the untouchables enter our temples.’

“The demonstration marked the start of a—Hindu protest against the proposal—that the future constitution of an independent India forbid discrimination against up to 60,000,000 untouchables, condemned by age-old Hindu religious practices to live as outcasts from birth to death.—

“(They) demanded also that the constitution—impose an absolute ban on the slaughter of cows, which Hindus consider sacred—and drop all proposed legislation which would interfere with Hindu religious practices.”

The priests explained a recent earthquake as due to “the sacrilegious action of the assembly in seeking to end untouchability.” Thus ever “The powers which seem to control man’s destiny” support their representatives here.

ANCIENT MEXICO

Prescott tells us of the Aztecs of Ancient Mexico; (Huitzilopochtli) “was the patron deity of the nation.—his altars reeked with the blood of human heckatombs in every city of the empire.—Scarcely an author pretends to estimate the yearly sacrifice throughout the empire at less than twenty thousand, and some carry the number as high as fifty thousand.—The companions of Cortez counted one hundred thirty-six thousand (skulls) in one of these edifices—Strange, that, in every country, the most fiendish passions of the human heart have been kindled in the name of religion.” (*History of the Conquest of Mexico*, ch. 3:28, 38-9)

CHAPTER IX

ISLAM

RELIGION OF THE SWORD

Sir Edward Freeman in his six Edinburgh lectures on the Saracens (3rd edition, 1876) speaks very warmly of "Mahomet," born at Mecca 570 A.D. as "this wonderful man (who established) his religion by himself and his first successors." (p. 6) "—in dealing with the character of this mighty man I (can now deal justly with it) without fear of misconception—" (p. 31) "Mahomet, the legislator and reformer of Arabia, I venture to revere along with (those) of other lands—the man who could gather the scattered tribes of his people into one great and united nation (and) sweep away the idols from the ancient temple of the Divine Unity." (p. 32)

"In the first stage of his prophetic career Mahomet appears as a preacher of righteousness, a meek and persecuted apostle. He next developed into a warrior and conqueror, uniting the scattered tribes of Arabia under one bond of spiritual and temporal obedience. Finally he commences that career of universal proselytism and conquest which he left to his successors to accomplish as regards so large a portion of Asia, Africa and Europe." (p. 34)

Personally poor, Mahomet at age 25 married a rich widow, Kadijah, whose business he had well served. All

his biographers mention a taint of epileptic disorder in his life: fits, spasmodic convulsions, trance periods with profuse sweatings, retirement to solitude in a cave, then visions, "divine revelations through the angel Gabriel." "Trusty followers wrote down (his) oral communications delivered in a trance." (Britannica, 1953, Mohammed. From now we shall use this prevailing English spelling of his name.) "In his fortieth year he began to announce himself as an Apostle of God, sent to root out idolatry, and to restore the true faith of the preceding prophets, Abraham, Moses and Jesus." (Freeman, p. 34) He converts Kadijah and relatives, gains followers slowly for twelve years, then is driven out of Mecca. He flees to Medina 270 miles northward in Arabia, 622 A.D. This is the year of the Hegira (flight)—now Year 1 of the Mohammedan calendar. Here Mohammed gains more followers for his gospel, the Koran, ever growing by additions of new revelations. Always this message: "There is no God but God (Allah); Mohammed is the Apostle of God."

God requires mercy and justice among men, temperance, alms-giving, no gambling. The Koran enjoins the Golden Rule, honest dealing, modesty, visit the sick, belief in its inspiration, prayer five times daily, cleanliness, certain fasts and at least one holy pilgrimage to Mecca. It forbids idolatry and promises "those who believe and do good works and—work righteousness" an eternal paradise abounding in ease, comfort and pleasure; "As for the unbelievers—they shall be companions of hell fire; they shall continue therein forever." (Koran.)

Soon his following grew rapidly: new converts in Medina, old friends and believers, fugitives following from Mecca, proselytes from desert tribes. Now his position changed from that of fugitive to that of leader with power. The tone of his revelations now changes: Gabriel brings him new messages from heaven. This in the Koran, chapter VIII:

“I will cast a dread into the hearts of the unbelievers. Therefore strike off their heads and strike off all the ends of their fingers. This shall they suffer, because they have resisted God and his Apostle—and the infidels shall also suffer the torments of hell fire.—Verily the worst cattle in the sight of God are those who are obstinate infidels—prepare against them what force you are able, and troops of horse, whereby ye may strike terror into the enemy of God and your enemy—O prophet, God is thy support—stir up the faithful to war—if there be a hundred of you, they shall overcome a thousand of ‘those who believe not.’” (NOTE Compare Levit. 26:8-39; Josh. 32:10) “This is the right religion:—attack the idolators in all the months, as they attack you in all; and know that God is with those who fear him,—Go forth to battle,—and employ your substance and your persons for the advancement of God’s religion.”

Washington Irving quotes Mohammed as saying: “—the miracles of Moses and Jesus have been treated with unbelief. I, therefore, the last of the prophets, am sent with the sword. Let those who promulgate my faith enter into no argument or discussion; but slay all who refuse obedience to the law. Whoever fights for the true faith, whether he fall or conquer, will surely receive a glorious reward.

“The sword is the key of heaven and hell; all who draw it in the cause of the faith will be rewarded with temporal advantages; every drop shed of their blood, every peril and hardship endured by them, will be registered on high as more meritorious than even fasting or praying. If they fall in battle, their sins will at once be blotted out, and they will at once be transported to paradise, there to revel in eternal pleasures in the arms of black-eyed houris.” (Mahomet and his Successors: Vol. I: 154)

Thus the Religion of the Sword began. The victims were given three options; 1) Join Islam; 2) Submit (without conversion) and pay tribute; 3) Suffer death. Moham-

med himself opened this program by leading three minor attacks on caravans. Those of his enemies, the Koreishites who drove him from Mecca, were especially singled out. The first, at Bedr, was won "by the help of angels sent by God." The Meccans (623 A. D.) retaliated with 3,000 men, defeating Mohammed's 1,000. This was explained or excused by the doctrine of "Fate:" A man dies, at home or in battle, if his appointed hour has arrived.

Again (626 A. D.) the Meccans with 10,000 men came out against Medina and Mohammed's 3,000. Because of loss of preliminary contests between individual champions, scared by a storm and deserted by some allies who had been fed artfully with fear and doubt by Mohammed's emissaries, the Meccans abandoned their attempt and went home. Mohammed explained: "God sent a storm and a legion of angels which you did not see."

Immediately, at the angel Gabriel's suggestion, Mohammed besieged a Jewish community (one of the groups allied against him there). After twenty-five days these "surrendered at discretion" (of the victors.) A Moslem captain, exercising this "discretion," condemned all the men, some 700, to death, their wives and children to slavery and their property to the soldiers. (Irving I, ch. 23) "Mohammed extolled the justice of this sentence as a divine revelation sent from the seventh heaven, and had it punctually executed." (Ockley: History of the Saracens. p. 42) Freeman (p. 43) greatly deprecates this, but calls it "a trifle compared with the ordinary horrors of oriental warfare, and that it stands alone in the career of Mohammed."

In 629 A. D. under a treaty and backed by 10,000 followers, Mohammed entered Mecca peaceably, took over the sacred shrine, the Kaaba, destroyed its 360 pagan idols, turned it into a Moslem shrine and sanctuary, told the Meccans they were his slaves by conquest but pardoned and freed them, accepted their conversion to Islamism and

returned to Medina. Soon word came from all parts of Arabia of tribal conversions to Islamism. In 631 he made a farewell pilgrimage to Mecca followed by a reputed throng of 100,000 believers. He made the prescribed seven circuits around the Kaaba, each time kissing the sacred black stone in the corner of the wall; offered a sacrifice of 100 camels (food for the pilgrims) and, being sixty-three (lunar) years old, killed sixty-three of them himself. No one but a Moslem may now approach the Kaaba, on pain of death.

The Koran, admittedly one of the world's great "bibles," is a book of 596 pages (including foot notes). On thirty random pages the word God or Lord appears 252 times (8.4 times per page). The angel Gabriel, bearer of its divine revelations, is presumably the same heavenly messenger who brought Elizabeth and Mary word of their "divine pregnancies" with John and Jesus. (Luke i: 19, 26)

The Koran's revelations permit a man to have four wives at one time. Mohammed was faithful to Kadijah alone while she lived but after that, by several special revelations the Prophet took many more. "The authors who give him the smallest number of wives own that he had fifteen." (Ockley 63)

Mohammed died June 8, 632 A. D. He was succeeded in turn by Abu-Bekr, Omar, 634; Othman, 644; Ali, son-in-law, 655-660, as Caliphs (successors) who ruled Islam for twenty-eight years, combining powers of emperor and pope, over the civil and religious interests of their followers. The Moslem successes that follow may be credited largely to "the weakness of their enemies. The birth of Mohammed was fortunately placed in the most disorderly and degenerate period of the Persians, the Romans and the Barbarians of Europe;—In the ten years of the administration of Omar, the Saracens reduced to his obedience 36,000 cities or castles, destroyed 4,000 churches or temples of the unbelievers and edified 1400 moschs for the exercise of the

religion of Mahomet. One hundred years after his flight from Mecca, the arms and reign of his successors extended from India to the Atlantic Ocean, over—I. Persia; II. Syria; III. Egypt; IV. (North) Africa; V. Spain." (Gibbon IV: 404). But first:

ARABIA AND CHALDEA

Scarcely was Mohammed buried when campaigns were begun to take over east and south Arabia, this, with much bloodshed took about a year. In the great battle of Yemen in the south, 40,000 Moslems in a "first action lost 1200 men; this soon was avenged by the slaughter of 10,000 infidels." (Gibbon IV:402) Abu-Bekr sent two expeditions into cities along the Persian Gulf, into Chaldea and up into the Mesopotamian region as far as Faradh (the 33rd parallel). City after city was taken, put under tribute or destroyed.

SYRIA

Under these caliphs, Syria (all Palestine), then in the Eastern Greko-Roman Empire under Heraclius, had to be "rescued" from the infidels (Jews and Christians). Abu-Bekr, under unlimited commission from Mohammed to fight "till all the people were of his religion," now sent this message to the Arabian Saracen leaders:

"In the name of the most merciful God:

"(I Abu-Bekr) to the rest of the true believers; health and happiness, and the mercy and blessing of God be upon you. I praise the most high God, and I pray for the prophet Moahammed. This is to acquaint you that I intend to send the true believers into Syria, to take it out of the hands of the infidels. And I would have you know that the fighting for religion is an act of obedience to God." (Ockley, 92).

An invasion followed; an intercepting force of 1200 Roman soldiers was destroyed; five cities were taken; Damascus was imperiled. Rome sent 5,000 soldiers to its defense; a siege followed; Rome then sent 100,000 more soldiers, then another 70,000. There was intrigue and treachery and two great battles. 50,000 Christians were killed in one day. After more rivers of blood Damascus surrendered in August, 634 A. D. Its inhabitants were exiled, carrying away rich treasure with three days of grace, then pursued, utterly destroyed and all treasure retaken. (Ockley 103-160)

Omitting detail: The conquest of Syria was completed in 639. City after city had fallen. Jerusalem, besieged for four months surrendered by agreement, 637, for peaceful existence and payment of tribute. After losing a battle Antioch surrendered, paying a tribute of 300,000 golden ducats.

PERSIA

Much of this time Persia has likewise been undergoing conquest: Omar began it in 634. In the battle of Kadesia, 636 A. D., 30,000 Moslems defeated 120,000 Persians (Ockley 145-148) and 7,000 Moslems and 30,000 Persians were reported killed. (Irving II: ch. 27) The same year that Jerusalem was captured the Persians abandoned their capital, Mayden, and its immense riches. Their king was pursued from city to city. "Ispaham, one of the brightest jewels of his crown—never recovered." Modern travelers speak of its deserted streets, its abandoned palaces, its silent bazaars.—Istakar, (the ancient Persepolis) the national pride of the Persians, "defended in vain by 120,000 men, was compelled to pay tribute to the Arabian Caliph." (Irving, II:295-6) "Province after province fell. The king was finally overtaken and killed and 651 A. D., (Persia) fell under the undisputed sway of the Caliphs." (Irving II:298)

EGYPT

Already the conquest of Egypt was under way. One of Omar's generals, Amru, returning from Syrian wars, was sent into Egypt, 639 A. D. Farwak, "the key to Egypt," fell after a month's siege. With 4,000 men Amru next besieged Misrah (formerly Memphis, now Cairo) in vain for seven months. Then reinforced by 4,000 more and, aided by treachery, Cairo surrendered under tribute of 12 million ducats yearly. (Ockley 257-9)

Next Alexandria, besieged for fourteen months (the Saracens losing 23,000 men), capitulated in 640. The city was spared under tribute but of the great library, by command of the caliph Omar: "If the books agree with the book of God (the Koran), they are not necessary; if otherwise they should be destroyed," the books were distributed among the 4,000 public baths of the city and served to heat their waters for six months. This has been questioned but late authorities support it. (Ockley 264) A Moslem retorts that the Christian Crusaders burned the library of Tripoli of 3 million volumes because the first room entered contained nothing but the Koran. (Gibbon iv: 458) In 645 Alexandria was freed by Roman arms, retaken, 647, and its defending walls torn down. Egypt was laid under a tribute of 4,300,000 pieces of gold. (Gibbon iv: 458-9)

NORTH AFRICA TO THE ATLANTIC: This 2,000 mile strip of Mediterranean coast of limited width took much longer to subdue. In 647, Othman caliph, a Moslem army of 40,000 camped before the walls of Tripoli, cut to pieces a body of Greek troops sent to its support, then defeated and routed a native army of 120,000. But, reduced by battle losses and disease, the Moslem army "after a campaign of fifteen months (was) led back—victorious but diminished—into Egypt, encumbered with captives and laden with booty." (Irving II, ch. 35); (Gibbon IV. ch. 51)

For more than twenty years Islam was rent by division and civil wars over successions to the caliphate. It had begun to degenerate under Othman; Ali struggled through five years at efforts at reform. Othman, 655; Ali, 660; and Hassan his oldest son, 669; were murdered. Moawiyah (Muavia) Caliph (660-680) moved the caliphate to Damascus. In 661 his Egyptian governor, Amru, sent Akbah (Ocba) to complete the conquest of North Africa. With 10,000 horsemen Akbah swept westward with growing strength, besieged and retook rich, populous Cyrene (opposite Greece) which had freed itself from its subjugation of fifteen years earlier. Pressing west he stopped short of Carthage, cleared a forest and (670-680) built in the wilderness an interior city, Cairowan, thirty-five miles from the sea, thus safe from piracy, and an Islamic citadel against Berbers or Moors. In the 680's he pushed on across what is now Algiers and Morocco "subduing their infidel inhabitants or converting with the sword." (Irving II: 386) He reached the Atlantic coast about 685 and, riding his horse into the waves, is reported to have exclaimed: "Great God! If my course were not stopped by this sea, I would still go on to the unknown kingdoms of the west, preaching the unity of thy holy name, and putting to the sword the rebellious nations who worship any other Gods than thee." (Gibbon IV: 465) He was killed soon thereafter. In 698 Hassan, Moslem governor of Egypt, with an army greater than any that had entered Africa, attacked Carthage and destroyed it utterly by fire. The North African Moors embraced Islam and coalesced with the Arabs in their advance into Spain and France. The "Latin civilization and Latin Christianity gradually disappeared by the decay and extermination of their votaries." (Freeman 86)

Going back: In 668 Moawiyah had besieged Constantinople in vain. In winter the Moslems retired to an island some eighty miles away. "Six years were (passed thus), thousands of lives were lost by disease; ships and crews by

wreck and disaster—fighting for paradise under the walls of Constantinople.” (Irving II: ch. 43) They ravaged the neighboring coasts of Europe and Asia but finally had to buy a truce from the Greeks by an annual tribute of 3,000 pieces of gold plus slaves and horses.

From a second siege of Constantinople, 717, they fared no better. Arabian sources record that of 180,000 Moslem warriors engaged only 30,000 survived. This (plus the battle of Tours below) saved Europe to Christianity and blocked the Moslems there until the Ottoman Turks, 1453, at last took the city. This event, as described in chapter LXVIII of Gibbon’s Decline and Fall, will give the reader a more vivid impression of the meaning of my present chapter and of my purpose in writing it than any other reference I can suggest.

SPAIN: Aided by the disaffection and treachery of Count Julian, a Gothic (Spanish) General, the Arabs and Moors crossed to Spain at Gibraltar in 710. Many discontented Christians and Jews joined them. In the week-long battle of Xeres near Cadiz 16,000 invaders were slain, but with more treachery and defection among the defenders a Christian army of 90,000 to 100,000 was scattered and destroyed. (Gibbon IV:474) Malaga, Granada, Cordova, Toledo (the capital), Sidonia, Carmona, Seville (ancient capital), Saragossa, Barcelona, Merida, Salamanca, Tortosan, Valencia and many other cities up to the Pyrenees and the Bay of Biscay, were besieged where necessary, captured and reduced by 713.

In a (sample) treaty of surrender one ruler, Theodomir, agrees “freely (to) deliver his seven cities (named)—not assist or entertain the enemies of the calif: annually pay (for himself and each noble) one piece of gold, four measures (each) of wheat and barley, (some) honey, oil, vinegar, and each of their vassals—one moiety (half) (as much.) This represented uncommon lenity.” (Gibbon IV:479) As always, under tribute, freedom of life and religion prevailed

here, but “infidels” paid an income tax based on their means and *all* land owners were taxed one-fifth of their crops.

FRANCE: To close this section as quickly as possible: The Moslems continued into Gaul (France) as far as the Loire. Here they were more fierce and barbarous than in Spain, carrying off multitudes to sell into slavery. But in 732 the Gauls under Charles Martel overthrew them at Tours in a decisive battle. By 755 they were driven back into Spain. There they developed a very considerable culture with advances in science, chemistry, medicine, etc.

In that same 710, the “wonder year” of Moslem expansion when they entered Spain, they went north from Persia into the Asian wilds east of the Caspian, took Khorasan, crossed the Oxus and took Turkestan. This proved to be a most important conquest for, converted to this new religion, the Turks became for centuries its most fierce and dread promoters. Of these more presently.

From the 750’s onward Moslem power was badly divided: New Caliphates were set up at Bagdad on the Tigris (762-1258); at Cordova, Spain (755-1031); Cairoan, N. Africa (908), Cairo (967-1171). Their power was greatly weakened by strifes, both inner and with each other, for possession and control of the caliphates.

The Abbasside caliph, Harun al Raschid (the Just), ruling from Bagdad, 781-805, hero of the Arabian Nights, “eight times—invaded the territory of the Romans; and as often as they declined the payment of tribute, they were taught to feel that a month of depredation was more costly than a month of submission.” (Gibbon IV:524) When once the Emperor Nicephorus defied and challenged him, Harun’s reply “was written in—blood and fire on the plains of Phrygia” (Central Asia Minor). The Emperor sought and made peace—then, when Harun and his forces had returned to Bagdad, 500 miles away, he broke the treaty. “In the depth of winter” and over mountain snows Harun and his

forces returned 300,000 strong. The Emperor "escaped with three wounds from a field of battle overspread with forty thousands of his subjects."—(The Moslems) "swept the surface of Asia Minor—and invested the Pontic Heraclea.—The ruin was complete, the spoil was ample.—In the new treaty, the ruins of Heraclea were left forever as a lesson and a trophy." (Gibbon IV:525)

Rome and Islam fought over Asia Minor and Syria for centuries. In 828 the Roman Emperor Theophilus destroyed a Syrian town where was born Motassem, Haroun's youngest son. A captive matron made appeal to the honor of Motassem (calif, 833-842), who promptly organized an army to retaliate against a city in Phrygia, Asia Minor, Amorium, where the emperor's *father* had been born. After fifty-five days siege the city was taken. "The vow of Motassem was accomplished with unrelenting vigor.—To a point of honor Motassem had sacrificed a flourishing city, 200,000 lives (both sides) and the property of millions." (Gibbon IV:435-5)

Mahmud, a Moslemized Gaznevide Turk, ruling in Persia (997-1028), who invented for himself and all later Turkish rulers the title of Sultan, made twelve expeditions into northern India as far as the upper Ganges and put Lahore, Delhi and other cities under tribute. He demolished hundreds of temples and destroyed thousands of idols. When followers of the god Sumnat challenged Mahmud near Diu to contest the power of *their* god, "Fifty thousand of his worshipers were pierced by the spear of the Moslems; the walls were scaled; the sanctuary was profaned and the idol was smashed yielding a treasure of pearls and rubies concealed in (its) belly." (Gibbon IV:697-9) Today Islam remains the second largest religion, some 92 million followers, in the peninsula of India.

The Gaznevide Turks were succeeded by the Seljukian dynasty (1038-1152) who were the direct cause of the Christian Crusades (1096-1272) in which more than six mil-

lion people were killed (both sides). Togrul Beg their first sultan (1038-62), a fervid Mohammedan, was named "temporal vicegerent over the Moslem world" by the gradually weakening Abbasside Caliph Cayem whom he had to protect. He was the first Turkish sultan to attack the (Eastern) Roman Empire and in Armenia in 1050 "the blood of 130,000 Christians was a grateful sacrifice to the Arabian prophet." (Gibbon IV:707-8) Togrul did not follow up this move against Rome but his nephew and successor, Alp Arslan (1063-72) did. He took from Rome the provinces of Armenia and Georgia. The war went on for years over the Roman territory of Asia Minor. The Emperor Romanus Diogenes went out in person to direct its course. "The great Seljuk Sultans—did not scruple utterly to devastate the interior of Asia Minor—at last, on the field of Manzikert (Malazkerd) in 1071 the East obtained one of its greatest triumphs over the West." (Freeman 126) The Romans were completely defeated; the Roman Emperor was made captive, brought before Alp Arslan, treated most kindly and respectfully "in a free and familiar conversation of eight days,—Alp Arslan dictated the terms of liberty and peace, a ransom of a million (some say 1,500,000), an annual tribute of 360,000 pieces of gold—" (Gibbon IV:712-14) This put all Asia Minor in the hands of the Moslem Turks where it stands as base of their empire today.

Late in the 13th century the Seljukian Turks gave way to the Ottoman (Othman or Osman) line which from 1299 on cleaned up the Christian residues in Asia Minor. The Ottoman Turks arose out of "organizations of ghazis (fighters for the faith), men sworn to wage ceaseless war on the infidel—These would naturally move on to any place where—the infidel was still being fought.—(Hence) the—success of the line of Ertughrul (d. 1281)—on the frontiers of Byzantium where in fighting the Christian a ghazi might best fulfill his destiny." (Britannica 1953, XXII, 590)

Ertughrul's son, Osman (Ottoman) was their first sultan.

By 1340 Osman and his son and successor, Orkhan (1324-62), were in control of practically all Asia Minor except a few coastal towns across from Constantinople. By 1345 they had crossed the Dardanelles. Then slowly they advanced over the whole Balkan peninsula, including what we now know as Thrace, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Greece, Serbia, Yugoslavia, Albania and on up far above the Danube into Rumania and Hungary. There were battles and sieges too numerous to record here. The Christian youths captured were put into training for the Turkish armies and named janissaries. Tamerlane's Mongols interrupted the Turkish successes early in the 15th century but by 1422 the Turks had well recovered and besieged Constantinople. This was again a failure but the (East) Roman emperor agreed to pay the Turks a heavy annual tribute. In 1448 the Turks defeated at Kosovc "the largest army mustered by the Hungarians against (them)." In 1453 the Turks took Constantinople by assault and have held it ever since.

The great churches of Constantinople, built for Christian worship, and especially that of St. Sophia, "the glory of Byzantine art, and one of the most beautiful buildings in the world" (Britannica) have been converted into Mosques.

Late in the 17th century there were European power combinations against the Turks and gradually their own power declined; gradually they lost control of their European territory except for Constantinople and its near surrounding area (Turkey in Europe) which now comprises but three percent of the Turkish domain.

Since 1923 Turkey has become a largely modernized republic of which Anatolia or Asia Minor comprises the other ninety seven per cent. Polygamy, state religion and the Mohammedan code of laws have been discarded, the Turkish Caliphate abolished; women may now get divorces and hold public office. Here we must close Islamism with the statement that today as a world religion it has some 316 million followers, second only to Catholicism's (claimed)

421 millions and followed by Confucians, 300; Hindus, 255; Protestants, 193; Buddhists, 150; Eastern Orthodox, 128; Jews, 11 millions.

Most people are willing to admit that "They are all false but one." I am unable to discover any proper grounds for the exception. On what grounds does your exception rest that cannot be claimed by all the others?

In a comparatively few pages and a few hours time the reader has had a peep through a tiny crack into centuries and continents of atrocities by 'God's own elect' on a super-colossal scale. Can one doubt that the God-Idea was pre-eminent, even predominant in the minds of untold hundreds of thousands of these servants of the Almighty? And yet this seems to have extinguished in them every human impulse.

We face the dilemma that these priests, leaders and followers were just naturally sadistic human brutes, or they were credulous, devout but emotional, ignorant, self-deluded believers in the God-idea and in their own supposedly God-revealed mission; or many were religious racketeers, hypocritically pretending to a belief that would give them leadership, power, ease of life over a still more credulous, ignorant, deluded human mass. Indeed we may say safely that there were countless thousands under each classification. Those who were sincere as to belief in their call to a bloody mission may well have felt it to be to help punish here the witches as agents of the Devil or to help bring eternal salvation in heaven (by forced conversions) to the mistaken heretics who were rejecting God's message of Divine love.

Torments of the Inquisition would be as nothing compared to the eternal tortures of the damned in hell as promised to the unrepentant by the loving Father and his blessed Son in their 'revealed Word.' So we are told when, at his last supper with his disciples, and just before his reputed ascent into heaven, Jesus is reputed to have said to them:

(Mark xvi:16) “—he that believeth not shall be damned.” or

(John iii:36) “—he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.”

What did the God-idea do through all those centuries and continents of bloody massacre to make those millions of God-devotees better, or even decent, members of a rational, mutually tolerable human society?

* * *

If mankind is to make such a fight and is ever to escape from “antiquity,” men will have to abandon all mythology. For God and all supernaturalism they will have to substitute as the fundamental basis of the Universe just Nature alone with all the properties and property relationships which the world’s unrestricted scientists have proved, or may prove openly, that Nature and her properties possess.

For the rest: Let each nation gear its system of education to a complete co-operation in sustaining and continuing this unsurpassable condition.

CHAPTER X

EXODUS: BOOK OF THE WORLD'S BIGGEST LIES

(You read and be the judge.)

The general run of Christian clergy tell the laity, the average uninstructed masses, that the bible is God's Word, inspired, holy: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God—" (II Timothy iii:15). They give no hint that it has been under intense critical study by the greatest language, bible and archaeological experts of the U. S. and Europe for some two hundred years. The first seven books: Genesis, Exodus,—Judges are now well recognized by scholars as consisting of several strands of religious tradition with added fragments and comments all woven together by many hands, over many centuries in various languages and dialects. As we have seen in some detail in Chapter IV.

The clerical silence before their flocks on the matter of this modern knowledge of the bible amounts almost to clerical conspiracy in deceit against their flocks and the world at large.

We cannot here enlarge further on these preliminaries. We must take to the mass-mind of the world this biblical story (the reputed "Word of God"), as known by the vast body of uninformed, or misinformed "true believers." Our present business is to take statements from Exodus, chapter and verse, often brief, and put to the reader the question (Question A, or QA): Do you believe this to be true? Is

it "The Word of God?" If you do so believe, would you believe it if it were from some other book than the bible, or told that it occurred recently?

The really vital question for each reader now is not so much "Was that story true?" but rather: "What kind of a mind does my reaction to this tale show me to have? Am I a sane, rational-minded person or an utter gullible?" Call this one QB.

We shall be dealing many times with alleged words and acts of God; so let us first see what sort of God-ideas a "True Believer" is supposed to have. In Genesis i; ii:1-3; Exodus xx:11, we are told that God made the heaven and the earth and all that in them is: sun, moon, *stars* (i:14-17), plants, animals, birds, fish, men—in six days, and rested on the seventh.

Today's astronomers with spectrosopes and great telescopes prove definitely that our sun is one medium size star (all stars are suns) with nine planets (the Solar system) moving around the center of a vast galaxy, the Milky Way, containing 100,000,000,000, a hundred thousand million other suns. (See any modern astronomy.) That trip around its center takes us about 200,000,000 years. They estimate about a billion galaxies in the visible universe. So much for the size of the job the biblical God did in his six days of creation.

If there be only one God, it must be he who in the Old Testament talks and operates so personally and intimately and spends so much time with Moses, Aaron and the Hebrews—the "Children of Israel."

Here we may well put QA and QB on the Genesis Creation Tale itself.



God, Moses and Aaron seem to be trying to persuade Pharaoh, ruler of Egypt, to let the Hebrews go free. They

bring repeated calamities upon both Pharaoh and Egypt so as to force him to do so, yet repeatedly God hardens Pharaoh's heart so that he continues to refuse. (Ex. iv:21) Put QA.

With so much introduction, and understanding that God is referred to repeatedly as "the Lord," or "the Lord, the God of your fathers" (or "of the Hebrews," or "of Israel") we now proceed:

(1) (Ex. iii:6—iv:5; vii:8-13) Moses and Aaron carried magic rods. At command of God Moses cast down his rod and it became a serpent; picked up by the tail it became a rod again. Later at command, before Pharaoh, Aaron's rod likewise became a serpent. Then Pharaoh's magicians duplicated the trick; their rods became serpents; "but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods. And he (God) hardened Pharaoh's heart." He wouldn't let the Hebrews go. God had promised (iv:21) "I will harden his heart." HERE PUT QA.

(2) (vii: 14-25) At God's command Moses and Aaron stretched their magic rods "upon the waters of Egypt, upon (their streams, rivers, ponds, all their pools) of water, that they may become blood;" Then "the fish—died; and the river stank—and there was blood throughout all the land of Egypt." But again "Pharaoh's heart was hardened, neither did he hearken unto them." HERE PUT QA.

(3) (vii:25—viii:15) After seven days God told Moses to tell Pharaoh to "Let my people go," or else "I will smite all thy borders with frogs: And the river shall bring forth frogs abundantly, which shall—come into thine house, and into thy bed chamber, and upon thy bed,—and upon thy people, and into thine ovens, and into thy kneading troughs; And Aaron stretched out his hand—and the frogs came up and covered the land of Egypt."

Pharaoh begged for relief; promised to "let the people go" if by "tomorrow" the frogs were removed. This was done; then again "he hardened his heart" and refused. HERE PUT QA.

(4) (viii:16-19) Thereupon, at the Lord's command through Moses, Aaron "with his rod—smote the dust of the earth and—all the dust of the land became lice throughout all the land of Egypt.—and there were lice upon man and upon beast." But again "Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he hearkened not unto them." HERE PUT QA.

(4) (viii:20-32) Again, according to above patterns and after warning by word of the Lord through Moses, "there came a grievous swarm of flies—into all the land of Egypt: the land was corrupted by reason of the swarm of flies." But God promised there should be no flies in "the land of Goshen, in which my people dwell." HERE PUT QA. Again Pharaoh pled, promised, was relieved of the fly plague, "hardened his heart at this time also" and again reneged.

(6) (ix:1-7) Again through Moses the Lord threatened "a very grievous murrain" "upon thy cattle—, upon the horses (asses, camels, oxen) and upon the sheep." The Lord gave Pharaoh one day of grace. "And the Lord did that thing on the morrow, and all the cattle of Egypt died: but of the cattle of the children of Israel died not one.— And the heart of Pharaoh was hardened and he did not let the people go." PUT QA.

(7) (ix:8-12) This time without warning but by the Lord's command to Moses and Aaron they sprinkled furnace ashes "up toward heaven; and it became a boil breaking forth with blains upon man and upon beast."—"And the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh and he hearkened not unto them." PUT QA.

(8) (ix:13-35) Again: "Thus saith the Lord God of the Hebrews, Let my people go that they may serve me. For I will at this time send all my plagues upon thine heart,—servants, and—people; that thou mayest know that there is none like me in all the earth.—in every deed for this cause have I raised thee up, for to show (in) thee my power and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth."

God now promises "to rain a very grievous hail, such

as hath not been in Egypt since the foundation thereof even until now;" tells him to bring in the cattle (See 6: All dead already)—; for every man and beast—out in the fields "the hail shall come down upon them and they shall die."

So "Moses stretched forth his rod—and the Lord sent thunder and hail,—and the hail smote throughout all the land of Egypt all that was in the field, both man and beast; and the hail smote every herb of the field and brake every tree in the field. Only in the land of Goshen, where the children of Israel were, was there no hail."

Again Pharaoh pleads, promises—Moses spreads "his hands unto the Lord; and the thunders and hail ceased, and the rain (stopped.)" Again Pharaoh reneges. PUT QA.

(9) (x:1,2) Here God admits to Moses: "I have hardened (Pharaoh's) heart, and the heart of his servants, that I might show these my signs before him: and that thou mayest tell in the ears of thy son and of thy son's son, what things I have wrought in Egypt, and my signs which I have done among them; that ye may know how that I am the Lord." This makes God definitely a "show-off" God. AGAIN PUT QA.

(10) (x:3-20) Again through Moses and Aaron comes "Thus saith the Lord God of the Hebrews" threatening a plague of locusts. These "shall cover the face of the earth" until it can't be seen; eat all that was left by the hail; "eat every tree." "fill thy houses—and the houses of all the Egyptians—" Thus: "The locusts went up over all the land of Egypt—they covered the face of the whole earth, so that the land was darkened; and they did eat every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees—and there remained not any green thing in the trees or in the herbs of the field, through all the land of Egypt."

Again the prayer: "intreat the Lord your God" for relief. "he" (one of the two) did so "And the Lord turned a mighty strong west wind, which swept the locusts—into the Red Sea; there remained not one locust in all the coasts of

Egypt." Yet once again "The Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart, so that he would not let the children of Israel go." Here put QA.

(11) (x:21-29) Now by 'established procedure' came a plague of "thick darkness in all the land of Egypt three days. They saw not one another, neither rose any from his place for three days: but all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings."

Now Pharaoh gives in; tells Moses: "Go ye, serve the Lord" take your children but leave your flocks and herds. Here Moses says No; those are necessary "that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God—But the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart, and he would not let them go."

Then they broke. Pharaoh told Moses: Get out; if we meet again I'll kill you. Moses answered: O. K., I'm gone.
HERE PUT QA.

(12) Chapters xi and xii are a bad 'jumble-mix' of J, E, D, P, (see chap. IV) plus two 'editors', R and S; This time the Israelites are really to get away, but the Lord and Moses plot a double blow against the Egyptians; (a) To "spoil" them of their gold and silver jewels and (b) to kill "all the firstborn in the land of Egypt—and all the firstborn of beasts" (xi:4-7). But the mix-up is so bad that one cannot tell which comes first. We take (a) the "spoiling" (plain robbery) first: (xi:1-3) "And the Lord said unto Moses—speak (to) the people, and let every man (and woman) borrow of (their) neighbor, jewels of silver and—gold." (NOTE: This time the Israelites do not live apart "in the land of Goshen" but as "neighbors") "And the Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians." Then (xii:35, 36)) "the children of Israel did according to the word of Moses; and they borrowed of the Egyptian jewels of silver,—of gold, and raiment: And the Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians,—And they spoiled the Egyptians." (This "favor" shown after all those plagues!) HERE PUT QA.

(13) (xi:4—xii:33) This comes in between the last two quotations. (b) “And Moses said, Thus saith the Lord, About midnight I will go out into the midst of Egypt: and all the firstborn in the land of Egypt shall die, from the firstborn of Pharaoh—unto the firstborn of the maidservant—and all the firstborn of beasts.—But against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue, against man or beast:—” “And the Lord said unto Moses. Pharaoh shall not hearken unto you; that my wonders may be multiplied in the land of Egypt.” (xi:4-9) More “show-off.”

Now to spare the Israelites in this pending massacre, a Passover feast was arranged. They were to sacrifice lambs, “a lamb to a house” (xii:3) and sprinkle its blood on their the Egyptians; and when he seeth the blood—the Lord will door posts (xii:22) “For the Lord will pass through to smite pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in—to smite you.” (xii:23)

Thus it was done and “at midnight the Lord smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt—and all the firstborn of cattle.—and there was not a house where there was not one dead.” (xii:29, 30) So now Pharaoh yields and sends them away, flocks, herds, and all. (31-33) PUT QA.

Here follows account of the “favor” (12 above) with bad breaks in the context both before and after it. *When was this favor gained, when shown?*

(14) Now they were all free. “And the children of Israel journey from Rameses to Succoth, about *six hundred thousand* (!) on foot that were men, besides children. And a mixed multitude went up with them; and flocks and herds and very much cattle.” (xii:37, 38) NOTE: The Hebrew word *taph*, translated ‘children’ is to be understood as including women. Thus the total would run to two and a half million or more. PUT QA.

(15) This, then, is the horde that, with their luggage—they took tents (xvii:16)—now crosses the Red Sea, parted by Moses’ hand, “upon the dry ground: and the waters were

a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left.” (xiv:21, 22, 29) PUT QA.

(16) When “all Pharaoh’s horses, his chariots and his horsemen” “went in after them,” (xiv:23) “the Lord—took off their chariot wheels.” (24, 25)

Now, at God’s command, “Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea,—and the waters returned, and covered—all the host of Pharaoh that came into the sea after them; there remained not so much as one of them. But the children of Israel walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea; and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left. Thus the Lord saved Israel that day (from) the Egyptians.” (Ex. xiv:26-30)

This account seems to indicate definitely that the escapees, with cattle and “spoils,” or most of them, were yet in the sea “on dry land,” ‘protected’ between walls of water while another part engulfed Pharaoh’s pursuing army. Put QA.

(17) Note now what an amazing lot of valuable time the ‘bible God,’ who allegedly made the astronomers’ universe of some billions of billions of suns (the stars are now known to be suns) on the 4th day (Gen. i:14-19), has been taking off from his other universal interests to trigger around with these ‘children of Israel.’ To create “*on the 4th day*,” “in the beginning” those sextillions of suns surely needed more time. It is in such figures astronomers now estimate the size of the visible universe. Put QA.

QUESTION: What sort of training was all this theft by ‘borrowing’ and murder of first-born for Moses who, six chapters later and less than 200 miles further on, was to help write in the Ten Commandments: “Thou shalt not kill” (nor steal)?

(18) Now this Israelite horde (some 2½ million people) had to eat, be clothed and sheltered. It seems they got along a month and a half on what they took with them. Then they got hungry and “murmured against Moses and Aaron (say-

ing) ye have brought us forth into this wilderness to kill (us) with hunger. Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold I will rain bread from heaven for you." (xvi:1-4) This was "manna." (xvi:15) Moses said they would understand it all "When the Lord shall give you in the evening flesh to eat, and in the morning bread to the full." (xvi:6-8). "And it came to pass that at even the quails (the meat) came up and covered the camp; and in the morning the dew (the manna—the bread) lay round about the host." (xvi:13) "and the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited they did eat manna, until they came to—Canaan." (xvi:35) Put QA.

(19) They were allowed to gather only one day's supply for each person each day. Excess portions gathered "bred worms and stank" (xvi:16-20) But "on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread,—and they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade; and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein.—for today (the seventh day) is a sabbath unto the Lord; today ye shall not find it in the field.—and they found none." (xvi:22-27) Thus for forty years. (xvi:35) Put QA. Thus the Fourth Commandment (then unwritten), to observe the sabbath, was anticipated.

(20) In the wilderness "there was no water" (xvii:1-7) and the people cried to Moses "give us water that we may drink."—"and the Lord said unto Moses—take—thy rod—and go. Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink. And Moses did so—" We are left to infer that the water came, but not so told. Thirty-five years later (by bible dating) and in another place Moses repeats this rod, rock and water stunt (Numbers xx:10-11) with announced success.

(21) (Exodus xvii:8-14) "Then came Amalek (a tribe) and fought with Israel—Moses said unto Joshua, choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek: tomorrow I will stand on the top of the hill with the rod of God in my hand"

They did so. "when Moses held up his hand,—Israel prevailed; and when he let (it) down, Amalek prevailed." Moses got tired. But "Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands—. And Joshua (won)." Put QA.

(22) (xix:19-25) At last Moses and the Israelite horde came to Mount Sinai, "camped before (it). And Moses went up unto God." The Ten Commandments were about to be given and God told him many things: thus (xix:12, 13) "set bounds unto the people—whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death: There shall not a hand touch it, but he shall surely be stoned or shot through." Moses and Aaron might come up, "but let not the priests and the people break through to come up unto the Lord, lest he break forth upon them." (xix:24)

As Moses told it, such was the needful secrecy of his meeting with God. The Ten Commandments (Ex. xx:3-17), an E document, were about to be given; not a witness from among people or priests. God and Moses produce two other versions of the Ten Commandments: *a.* (Deut. v:6-21), a D or a P document in which Mount Horeb is named as the locality and *b.* (Ex. xxxiv: 14-26) a J document, to be discussed presently. In this first (Ex xx) version God merely 'recites' the Ten Commandments; no recording on Tables of Stone or otherwise is reported until (xxiv:12-18) where "the Lord said unto Moses, come up to me into the mount—and I will give thee tables of stone—And Moses went up—and Moses was in the mount forty days and forty nights." PUT QA.

(23) Now God gives Moses seven chapters of minute instructions on many matters closing (xxxii:18) with "And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, the two tables of the testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God."

Meanwhile the people, impatient at Moses' long delay, gave Aaron their gold ear-rings and told him to "make us gods, which shall go before us;" (xxxii:1-14) Aaron melts

them into a golden calf, “built an altar before it” and made a feast. The Lord sees this; orders Moses: “Go, get thee down,” and prepares to “consume them” in his wrath. Moses argues against this, saying “turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people.” And so “the Lord repented—.” PUT QA.

(24) Then “Moses turned, and went down (xxxii:15-28)—and the two tables—written on both their sides—and the writing was the writing of God.” Moses gets down, “saw the calf and the dancing; (his) anger waxed hot, and he cast the tables out of his hands, and brake them—” When he called for “Who is on the Lord’s side—all the sons of Levi (assistants to the priests) gathered themselves together unto him. And he said unto them, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel. Put every man his sword by his side, and go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion and every man his neighbor. And the children of Levi did (so) and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men.” PUT QA.

(25) And how did God react to this wholesale slaughter of three thousand simpletons straight following the smashing of his precious tablets with their sixth Commandment: “Thou shalt not kill”? He must have been right there through it all for with amazing patience:

(Ex. xxxiv:1-4) “—the Lord said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone—and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest. And be ready in the morning, and come up in the morning—to me in the top of the mount. And no man shall come up with thee—and Moses rose up early in the morning and went up unto mount Sinai,—and took—the two tables of stone.” PUT QA.

Now God and Moses work out a new and *almost wholly different* Ten Commandments (xxxiv: 14-26) beginning: (1) 14: “For thou shalt worship no other god: for the Lord,

whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God:—” 15, 16; (II) 17: “Thou shalt make thee no molten gods.” (III) 18; (IV) 19, 20; (V) 21; (VI) 22; (VII) 23; 24, God explains; (VIII) 25; (IX) 26: “The first of the first-fruits of thy land thou shalt bring unto the house of the Lord thy God.” (X) 26: “Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother’s milk.”—“And he (Moses) was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.” (xxxiv:28)

That takes eighty days and nights from a God with a big universe to manage and gives us our second set of Ten Commandments. PUT QA.

(26) As we proceed on the biblical assumption of only one God, he seems to have “run out on” his billion other galaxies with their sextillions of other solar systems, planets and inhabitants (if any) during those forty years so as to keep company with and give personal directions to these wandering Israelites. As recorded in Exodus he

a. Spent forty days and nights twice over with Moses on the mount.

b. Gave directions for handling of slaves and purchased wives (xxi:1-11)

c. Further, he commands (xxi:17) “He that curseth his father or his mother shall surely be put to death.”

d. (xxi:22-25) After certain striving “if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe.”

e. (xxii:18) “Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.”

f. (xxv:1-3) “And Moses said unto them (the children of Israel): These are the words (of) the Lord—: Six days shall work be done but the seventh—shall be—a sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire (in your homes) upon the sabbath day.”

g. (xxix:1-46) In sacrificing “one young bullock and two rams without blemish” after the bullock and first ram are killed, bled and burned, (19-20) Moses is told “And thou shalt take the other ram, and take of his blood, and put it upon the right ear of Aaron, and upon the tip of the right ear of his sons, and upon the thumb of their right hand, and upon the great toe of their right foot,—” and so on for seventeen more verses where (38-42) it changes to a sacrifice of “two lambs—day by day continually.—”

Read chap. xxix and see how priests and clergy of today ignore “God’s commands” for the conduct of worship according to his will. Fresh meat always in abundance for the priests! PUT QA.

h. (xxx:17-21) The Lord told Moses to “make a laver of brass—and put water therein. For Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands and feet thereat:—when they come near to the altar—”

i. (xxx:22-38) “The Lord spake unto Moses— “giving him recipes for 1. “a holy anointing oil” and 2. “a perfume—pure and holy—” both so holy that anyone who makes either “shall even be cut off from his people.”

j. (xxxiv:26) “Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother’s milk.”

(27) Now we return to Ex.xx:22 which begins: “And the Lord said unto Moses: Thus thou shalt say unto the children of Israel, Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven.” This follows directly after the giving of ‘the first’ Ten Commandments and the account of the people’s fright. It continues unbroken for sixteen verses, through xxi:11, the Lord giving commands with twenty-three ‘shalts’ or ‘shalt nots’ about gods of silver and gold, altars, sacrifices and the buying, selling and handling of women and slaves. (Note: The Hebrew words translated as ‘servant’ and ‘maid-servant’ really mean ‘slave’ and ‘slave girl’) Thus (xxi:1-11) “If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing.—If his mas-

ter have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free; Then his master shall—bring him to the door, or unto the door post;—bore his ear through with an aul: and he shall serve him forever. And if a man sell his daughter to be a maidservant, she shall not go out as the menservants do." Four verses of details for handling this situation follow. Such is the definitely pronounced "Word of God," on the subject of human slavery, as Exodus tells it. (See also Deuteronomy xv:12-18; Levit. xxv:44-46.) PUT QA.

(28) God now (xxvi:1-9, 40) needs "a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them," and shows Moses the pattern of the tabernacle, and—"of all the instruments thereof," and tells Moses to take up "an offering—gold, silver, brass," fine linen, skins, oil, spices, onyx stones etc., wherewith to make and furnish it. In high detail "the Lord (tells) Moses" how to make the tabernacle—a framed structure. This is to measure 30x10x10 cubits (45x15x15 ft.) Seven chapters (xxv-xxx) of elaborate instruction tell how to fashion it, "the ark (to hold) the testimony which I shall give thee, which was to be 2½x1½x1½ cubits, of wood overlaid "with pure gold within and without—and—a crown of gold round about." —A gold ring at each corner to hold staves overlaid with gold, "that the ark may be borne with them." (xxv:10-14) A "mercy seat of pure gold" with a gold cherub at each end facing each other and spreading gold wings over the seat; a wood table, 2x1x1½ cubits, overlaid with pure gold and with "a gold crown round about." (xxv:23-28) also with gold corner-rings and gold-plated staves to bear it; gold dishes, spoons, bowls; a six-branch, seven-lamp candlestick of pure gold with tongs and snuffdishes—of pure gold." (xxv:31-40) Gold here thrown around as common as clay in a brick-yard. Silver is used yet more freely. In addition was

highly elaborate jewelry work and needle work on curtains or fine linen, vestments etc., etc.

After the seven chapters of directions come six more chapters telling how the above orders were actually carried out (xxxi-xl). In chapter xxxviii:21-31 is a summing up of all the gold, silver and brass "of the tabernacle of testimony, as it was counted," Counting the units of weight a Talent equals 3,000 shekels and a shekel is 224 grains and, converting all to pounds avoirdupois (not Troy), we can tabulate as follows:

Weights of metals used in construction of
tabernacle and contents

The Metal	Talents	Shekels	Pounds Avoirdupois	Tons
Gold, "Pure"	29	730	2807	1.4
Silver	100	1775	9656	4.828
Brass	70	2400	6796	3.398

All this used in making a "Sanctuary to God" by some two to three million wandering escapees living on manna while wandering forty years in the wilderness and desert. Their number is re-checked in xxxviii:26 as 603,550 men "from twenty years old and upward."

The wild story of the Tabernacle in the wilderness (See 28 above) is now recognized and admitted by apologists to represent "not a historical structure—but an *ideal*—largely colored by reminiscences or traditions of the splendid temple of Solomon." (See Driver's Exodus. Appendix IV). It was a Priestly forgery of Exile or post-Exile days. The problem of the disentanglement of these various documents offers greater fascination than any cross-word or jig-saw puzzle ever invented.

Such is a sampling of the information and directions placed in the mouth of the alleged Creator and Sustainer of the Universe by priestly leaders. Put QA.

* * *

Many readers should be familiar with the fantastic tales of the Arabian Nights, Gulliver's Travels, Baron

Munchausen, the Paul Bunyan yarns, etc. If not, read some, then honestly compare and ask yourself soberly if in them you find any that equal in improbability and absurdity the fanciful nonsense recorded in Exodus, all held, believed and taught by millions of mistaught, deluded "True Believers" and simple-minded "Faithful Followers" to be "The Word of God, revealed, inspired." It is soberly taught as such by tens of thousands of Christian priests and clergy who are either grossly and inexcusably, or pitifully, ignorant; or else venal, hypocritical, intellectually dishonest—or all combined. These lying tales of Exodus have been the work of religious minds—some simple, kindly, honest, of native good will; others designing, self-seeking for ease, power, domination: racketeers, busy racketeering.

How not but that individuals here and there, egocentrics, etc., should become leaders (but many such equally ignorant, simple, sincere, with the rest of the tribe) establish relations with and do business with the alleged powers behind the veil? How else but that certain shrewd ones should find or make opportunity to establish himself as early day seer, prophet, priest, as interpreter or mouth-piece of the gods; fix feast days and altar sacrifices of doves, lambs, grain offerings, oil, wine, enough to support the priest in ease and comfort? (See I Samuel ii. 13-16; 34-36; Leviticus ii.; v.; vii—)

Today the ignorant and the credulous continue to be born daily by the millions, most of them forced through life to run a gantlet of lies and religious rackets. Today Science has natural explanations for what the ancients thought and called "acts of God."

CHAPTER XI

CHRISTIANITY OR HUMANISM—A RELIGION OR A DEVOTION?

“I sent my Soul through the Invisible,
Some Letter of that After-life to spell:
And by and by my Soul returned to me
And answer’d “I Myself am Heav’n and Hell.:”
The Rubaiyat, 5th Edition, LXVI.

The Christian Religion bases its appeal to mankind largely on the claim and general belief that behaviour, conduct, morals, are inseparably bound up with supernaturalism, and its practices—God, heaven, hell. As an English word, supposed to carry meaning, *religion* is reputed to have a hundred or so accepted (?) definitions. If we had a tenth that many for law, economics, aviation, we could not talk intelligently about any of them. To talk intelligently about religion and its relations to morals or to anything else, it must be defined and the talker must then hold himself and his hearers tight to the definition.

We took the first step to this end by defining Religion and we continue our endeavor to hold ourself and our readers to this same. After they read our chapter II showing the complete mutual independence of Morality and Religion, with Morality holding definite primacy as there shown, most Humanists, Secularists and Ethical Cultur-

ists will agree that the definition is definite and comprehensive, including the “repudiation” in Mr. Mencken’s contribution to the definition. But now they will have to define their Humanism, Secularism and Culture *and practice and promote these as defined*, so they will be known truly to include the “moral aims and ideas” which Religion as above defined is there charged with being able to repudiate, both by its gods and by its devotees. This power and actuality of repudiation I feel has been superabundantly demonstrated by the behaviour of Religion’s highest authoritative representatives and their hordes of mass followers over many centuries, in many lands, by many religions as shown by the irrefutable facts heretofore set forth.

In Christendom religion assumes the many forms of Christianity.

And what is Christianity?

The many forms give many answers but in the main they seem to agree that:

- 1.) The bible is the Word of God. (II Timothy iii:14-17)
- 2.) According to the bible, mankind fell from God’s grace through Adam’s (“original”) “sin.” (Genesis 11:12-21 iii:6-19) Therefore
- 3.) The human race has since been (and still is) going to perdition, (Romans v:10-25) (Witness the soul-saving Missionary Societies *) except for the biblical promise that:

* As a small boy at Presbyterian prayer meeting with parents I saw a returned missionary swing her pendulum arm and heard her say: “At every tick of the clock—?—thousands of Chinese are dropping into Christless graves, plunging into eternal hell.” Next Sunday I asked my Sunday School teacher, Mrs. Ollerenshaw, the minister’s wife, if all the people who died before Christ came went to hell. She said: “I’m afraid they did, Freddie.” I didn’t think that could be fair and said: “Well, it wasn’t their fault what Adam did.”

Thus early a skeptic was made. I haven’t been in a Presbyterian church for years, but I doubt not that this still remains good Presbyterian doctrine for the “non-free-thinkers;” Great instruction for your children!

“Infant damnation” for unbaptised babes, even the still-born, still terrorizes all Catholicism and much of Protestantism. Catholic nurses with syringe baptise in the womb if the babe is likely to be born dead! God hasn’t yet got over that Adam affair.

4.) "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son," (John iii:16) as a blood sacrifice for man's sins (Luke xxii:19,20; Rev. i: 5,6) so

5.) "that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." (John iii:16)

6.) Your eternal salvation depends not upon "works" but upon *faith* (yours) and upon grace (God's). This is according to Paul, the "great" apostle, to whom the Lord appeared directly with power. (Acts ix:1-19) Paul gives this doctrine in (Rom. iii:23-31; iv;v:1-9; II Tim. i:8,9; Titus iii:1-7; Also see Gen. xv:4-6.) James, however, in his general epistle (ii:14-26) denies and contradicts all this, so take your choice.

7.) At stated, periodic times the devotees (or, with Catholics, the priests) eat "the body of Christ" (bread and wafers) and drink "the blood of Christ" (wine) in commemorative communion service. See John vi:47-59

At every genuine Christian service public prayers are said to God asking him "in the name of Christ our Saviour and Redeemer" to give the devotees, (also) "those in (civil) authority," and generally the world at large, "wisdom" and various blessings.

If you believe in, and do, all these things, you are entitled to the name Christian. If not, you are not. Mr. Bertrand Russell has not been mealy-mouthed about this. He has given the world his reasons in a forthright brochure entitled: *Why I Am Not a Christian*. Read it.

There is no occasion to deny that many high truths, much great literature, impressive moral doctrine and interesting history of civilization's ancient days, are to be found in the voluminous records of most religions: Buddhist, Persian, Moslem, Christian and others. But those are inescapably tied in with an unconscionable amount of myths, legends, miracles, old wives' fables and bare falsehoods about gods, devils, angels, and with the necessity to rationalize them all; though many readers, doubtless, will say,

or think: "May be so in the religion of some group somewhere, but not in mine. My bible is the Word of God. It says so."

Science and the rising school of Modern Philosophy, based on science, common sense and reason, repudiate the myths, legends, miracles, etc. as such. *Civilization's future belongs to Science, Ethics and Humanism* if these awaken in time to the immediate peril of our days. The world can either follow their lead or make choice between Russia and the Roman Catholic Church. Protestantism is too divided, confused, befuddled, in its attitudes toward Science to count seriously in this struggle.

The other two, both utterly totalitarian, utterly undemocratic, would-be world powers, are now fighting each other for dominion over the minds of men, over a world to be kept in subjection by the mass terrorism of Russia's state police or by the mass ignorance of Catholicism's mind control and suppressions. A Church which kept on its list of forbidden reading for 219 years (1616-1835) Copernicus's world-shaking discovery that the sun, not earth, is the center of planetary motion, has forfeited all claim to be world controller of mass education. Its power depends on mass ignorance and it even exercises that power to prevent birth-control anywhere and so to preserve that source of total ignorance undiminished plus whatever other means it can devise to maintain that condition in every land where that power controls.

As between these two powerful threats Science and Humanism can find no choice. They must join hands to resist these menaces to freedom and intelligence, to enlighten ignorance, to destroy the fears of hell as punishment, and the illusions of heaven as a reward, for behaviours here and now. Decent behaviour because of fear or hope of future reward is not ethical conduct; it places itself on too low a level.

The function of Science is to discover, proclaim and

exalt the truth and teach the laws of nature. The function of Ethics is to discover, declare and teach the laws of moral behaviour, and of Humanism to practice, teach, proclaim, exalt all those laws—to promote good behaviour and the good life as a matter primarily of self-respect, then of human decency, of good sportsmanship, of individually learning a true scale of relative values. Humanism must teach men to be unsatisfied, each with himself, until he has put into and so got out of life the greatest possible amount of good citizenship, kindness, friendliness, humanness and unselfish happiness for a being born unwittingly and unchoosingly with the particular set of talents and deficiencies that emerged out of the bodily genes and chromosomes which comprised his total heritage from the past.

The program thus outlined might be regarded as amounting to another definition of Religion. But how could that be with Truth and Science included—Science, which the leaders and promoters of Religion have fought (long as “Science-so-called,”) persistently and stubbornly through the centuries?* (Note: See Andrew D. White's great, two-volume *History of the Conflict of Science with Theology in Christendom*.) The great question: *What things are true?* is basic for both Science and Ethics. This has never been the case with Religion and is not so right now. Religion's irreparable weakness and fatal deficiency lies in her perfunctory attitude toward, or violent opposition to, the truth. Only as Science, Ethics and Humanism unite in co-operative endeavor can any of them reach full stature and meet their proper duties to mankind.

But that program leaves out God, Christ's, alleged supernaturalisms, the miracles, falsehoods, old-wives' fables, which constitute Religion's whole support!

If one approves and adopts this program yet yearns to call it his Religion, there is no way to stop him; but if he so names it, he will be unable to fight free from Religion's

connotation of the supernatural and its age-long, world-wide record of irrationality and blood as just reviewed. And there stand Mencken and Russell in their philosophic semi-isolation. They deserve and should receive mass support in their stand. Why, then, would it not be better, at least for clearness' sake, to leave the word Religion to the supernaturalists? For Humanists to say simply, and without shame or fear:

"No. I am not a Christian; not religious. I am a Humanist and my Humanism is my Devotion. I am devoted in intent and purpose to respect for demonstrated fact; to love of the truth so far as I can distinguish between the true and the false; to the good life so far as my education and attained powers of judgment enable me to distinguish between right and wrong; to develop and attain to a personality unobliged to feel shame at being the sort of personality it knows itself to be; to all other decencies over which supernaturalism claims to monopolize direction and control but which have no bearing on relationships with the gods—only with relationships between human beings and towards the rest of Nature."

In the foregoing, 'Humanism' and 'Humanists' are but convenient, inclusive terms embracing also Ethical Culturists, Rationalists, the United Secularists, 'Free-Thinkers', all skeptical, incredulous, agnostic and atheistic philosophers and all open-eyed, open-minded, individuals, scientists and others. All these, disaligned from the supernatural because of its indifference to the facts of Nature, its disregard for reason and its disrespect for the truth, should now be making definite, positive efforts to create a comprehensive group of their own. Primarily such a group should pledge allegiance to the methods and truths of science, reject the supernatural and direct their devotions toward the realization of its ethical and humanistic ideals for the promotion of human welfare.

As for group name: Let it be decided in some group

conference of all. If anyone has a better name than a "Devotion," bring it forth. If some wish to split hairs, say to differentiate as among deists, theists, atheists, the group can state its latitudes. But they should be warned by the multiplied sects and sub-sects of religion. To me, "Humanism" and "Humanist" seem short, understandable and properly inclusive, if known and shown to stand on an adequate definition; also duly exclusive without being snobbish, aggressive or offensive. They are significant, *positively directed*, dignified, unifying, and seem to meet requirements as designation of an active, ethically-directed, socially-minded, democratic liberalism freed from supernaturalism. Any words that will better serve these purposes will be wholly acceptable.

Coined titles of "portmanteau" words, such as "Humaneths," or what have you, seem to me wholly unconvincing, though someone might find one where I can not. "Religion," however, will always savor too strongly of alliance (or misalliance) with the gods. Faust's, you may remember, was such a misalliance. In such alliances one can always discover a *quid pro quo*—the *quo* being social behaviour, the *quid* being some favor from the gods. In considering motivations for social behaviour, whenever we find the *quid pro quo* lacking we may conclude that the action has an ethical basis. Ideals such as those outlined above are the ones Humanism is expected to promote, but without the assistance of non-existent gods.

It is beyond question that the churches have thousands of sincere, honest, upright persons of good will—though with no lack of others less commendable. The main trouble with the "good" sort is that they feel and believe that their goodness, virtue, morality, is a consequence of their being religious when the exact reverse is the truth. They are religious because they were born with a natural strain of friendliness, kindness, helpfulness, gentleness, loveliness of personality. Like all babes they were born in helpless

ignorance and could learn only what they were taught. This is truly (and pitifully) a "most believing world." Even adults are not generally (nor even any too widely) advanced scholars or theologians. From childhood they have been taught, mostly by religious parents, that the bible is "God's Word," and are duly gathered into the church which is the "congregation of the righteous" for them. The vast majority have never learned that for cultured minds the most scholarly investigations of the bible have destroyed its claims of "Divine Inspiration" that Evolution has become the world-wide, established philosophy of the men of science and of persons of advanced culture in every civilized nation in the world. Scholarly clergymen, too, understand and accept it.

Many such have left orthodox pulpits for more liberal ones or for other fields. Such as remain make little or no attempt to enlighten their flocks as to the devastating effects of evolution and the conclusions of modern biblical scholarship upon the Christian scheme of "salvation." The wonderful Polychrome Bible practically "died a-borning" because the clergy would not bring it to the attention of the laity; more of Religion's truth suppressions. One further angle remains.

Not a few congregations of more advanced culture retain their membership and organization largely for use as a convenient social club where, as I have been told to my face: "No one believes that old stuff any more." But they listen to the prayers, sing the religious songs, join in the communion service and in some of them still recite the creed: "I believe in the resurrection of the body"—etc; much like trying to make a corpse function as a living body. Such people are largely not religious. I know three people who thus go, to three churches, on an essentially social basis. If *what things are true* be no serious matter to them in the domain of religion, how can it well be serious to them in other relationships? *Is* the truth important? Science and

Ethics hold it to be highly so. Religion (in practice) deals with it equivocally and perfunctorily; it must cling to miracles and suppress the truth in order to survive (thus far.)

For groups less favored educationally, socially, culturally, religion is a more serious business. There it gets its deep hold. There credulity dominates. There men really believe; are willing but ignorant victims of their own ignorance and give their support to the promotion of its errors and falsehoods. Emotion works strongest there and prejudice lies deepest.

EDUCATION

To love, search for and spread abroad truthful knowledge should head the list of Humanism's moralities—the first truth being that there is no necessary connection, relation, dependence, between Religion, the God-idea, Jesus, on the one hand and Morality on the other. Individuals of good will bound in ignorance to the God-idea and to Religion's false claim that living a good life here, now, and eternal salvation hereafter, depend upon religious faith, are the most stubborn resisters against fact and truth and thus are supporters of the evils that Religion's exploiters shoulder upon them and upon the world at large.

If, now, we are organized (and named?), let us ask, and decide quickly, whether it be not a present duty (say) to make it convincingly clear to adolescent youth that each must gain and fill acceptably a place of useful service in the world; that he will be making a well-nigh irreparable mistake, probably the great, fatal mistake of his lifetime, if he cast in his lot with crooks and hoodlums; that he will then ever be forced to know himself as being truly a hoodlum and crook at heart; that he can travel the high road or the low road of life and is bound to know on which he travels; that his own judgment of himself, his own

approval and/or disapproval of his own behaviour is the one judgment of supreme value to him; that he must live with himself day after day and ceaselessly acknowledge to himself: "I am a crook. If he has a family, his wife and children will know him as a crook and will perhaps some day call him one. He will die and be buried as a crook and while memory of him lasts it will bear the taint and odor of his crookedness. He can't beat the game of life as a crook, however much 'success' he may gain of wealth or position. (Quoted from a school chart I once wrote and sold; now out of print. F.E.) Hell won't be necessary, he will already have "squared" his own account. He has been a convict all his life, self-convicted, when, with proper early direction, he might well have lived a free man, unafraid and unashamed. Teach this doctrine unceasingly and with power. Read Emerson's *Compensation* and get men liberated from the idea that a heaven and a hell in prospect are necessary to keep men from being brutes. With all Religion's pronouncements they are not doing this today. Set forth the alternatives clearly that one may live his one life as a man or as a brute and that he gets paid off every day and hour just by being either the one or the other.* See to it that our public schools from kindergarten to the top teach and emphasize ethical human relationships of which the primary one is truthfulness among men—for yourself: intellectual honesty stands first. Of course there are incorrigibles. Against these society is entitled to protect itself by proper means.

With this job once in full swing Humanists may chart and tackle the next.

And right here now, for any sort of contemplated co-operative activity, I suggest as imperative that a rigid rule should prevail throughout such projected organization to forestall chance for any possible future grafters, graft or racketeering, or temptation for such, or grounds for charges of such to be made or believed:

* Here re-read the Rubaiyat verse which heads this chapter.

There must be a strict public accounting of all receipts and expenditures, with vouchers for the latter and duplicate, numbered receipts for contributions, except for collections at gatherings where a report vouched for by three tellers (one from the audience) must be made public promptly and, of course, recorded. All financial transactions and records to be open to inspection by properly interested individuals or groups willing to pay for the time and/or trouble thus required.

OUT! MESSAGE MINE!

Out! Message mine! Bear fearless heart!
Go face the world! Play well your part!
A thousand years too soon you're born
To find your pathway free from thorn.
You'll now find earth's untutored horde
Deceived about "God's Holy Word."
They deem it (scarce-read) what it's named
And well believe it all that's claimed.
Unskilled to argue or refute,
They'll close their ears in protest mute;
They'll shut their eyes nor view a world
With Evolution's wonders pearled.
Or certain their own thoughts can't stand
A gage of battle, hand to hand,
They'll move to block your circulation,
Attempting thus your isolation.
Still worse: They may seek legal right
To outlaw others from the sight.
They'll fierce assail you fore and aft
For thoughts that menace place or graft.
They'll utter cries of pain, you'll find,
As new ideas strike the mind;
Or that your words do not agree
With fancies learned at mother's knee.
Though lies will be against you hurled,
Your truths must ever help the world.

And so, do not too harshly blame;
Men did not shape what roads they came.
They did not frame the shapes they are—
All past and present make and mar.
With hope and patience show the mass
Their God-idea now won't pass.
When ten more centuries shall have gone
Men well may read you with a yawn,
Save those whose interest then may be
To learn what days could father thee.
Out! Message mine! Your case expound!
Though tabu now you'll yet win ground.
Remember Galileo's fight,
Lone, 'gainst black theologic night!
Out! In Causation's hopeful name!
To help men think is all your aim.
Your world-wide foe is ignorance.
Out! Help the world to win it's chance!
Man learns—resisting, slow, afraid:
“Man's God is in man's image made.”
Out! Message mine! Fear not men's hate!
You're now two thousand years too late.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01276 4298

